DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 5674 02306252 5

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY
PRE
5201 Woodward
Detroit, MI 48202
DATE DUE

RELEASED BY THE
DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY

STUDIES OF THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE
OF TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

NUMBER 11

ESSAYS IN COMPARATIVE EDUCATION

The International Institute of Teachers College, Columbia University

The INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE of Teachers College, Columbia University, was established in 1923 to carry out the following objects: (1) to give special assistance and guidance to the increasing body of foreign students in Teachers College; (2) to conduct investigations into educational conditions, movements, and tendencies in foreign countries; (3) to make the results of such investigations available to students of education in the United States and elsewhere in the hope that such pooling of information will help to promote and advance the cause of education.

The members of the staff of the International Institute, who at the same time are members of the University faculty, are

PAUL MONROE, Ph.D., LL.D., *Director*
GEORGE S. COUNTS, Ph.D., *Associate Director*
I. L. KANDEL, Ph.D., *Associate*
THOMAS ALEXANDER, Ph.D., *Associate*
LESTER M. WILSON, Ph.D., *Associate*
MILTON C. DEL MANZO, Ph.D., *Associate*
RUTH E. MCMURRY, Ph.D., *Associate*

ESSAYS IN COMPARATIVE EDUCATION

By

I. L. KANDEL, M.A., Ph.D.

PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION AND ASSOCIATE IN THE
INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE
OF TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Bureau of Publications
Teachers College, Columbia University
NEW YORK CITY
1930

Copyright, 1930
by
TEACHERS COLLEGE
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Civics
JAN 7 1931
225

370 K13
c.1

PREFACE

THE p[illegible]lume consists of lectures and articles on various phase[illegible] contemporary educational developments viewed from the comparative standpoint. They represent current tendencies in the past five years rather than an attempt at a systematic description of the educational system of any one country. Education is at present in a state of flux and it may be some little time before anything approaching stability will be reached in the post-War reconstruction that is described in the following pages. The student of comparative education may supplement the accompanying accounts with those presented since 1924 in the *Educational Yearbooks* and with the monographs issued by the International Institute that are listed on another page of this volume.

The author expresses his indebtedness to the editors concerned for permission to reprint a number of the articles that have already appeared in the *Teachers College Record*, *Independent Education*, *The Nation's Schools*, *School and Society*, *Educational Outlook*, and the *Proceedings of Schoolmen's Week* of the University of Pennsylvania.

I. L. KANDEL

New York, 1930

Public Library

PROPERTY OF

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Comparative Education as a Subject of Professional Study	1
The State and Education in Europe	9
The Administration of Education in England	23
The Making of Citizens in England	35
The American Spirit in Education	49
The Meaning of American Education	55
The Educational Situation	71
New Tendencies in Education	82
The Unrest in French Education	96
Nationalism and Education in Italy	108
Education of the Adolescent in England	118
The Challenge in Secondary Education	128
Standards of Achievement in European and American Secondary Schools	147
Education in Latin-American Countries	155
Educational Reform in Mexico	163
Aspects of Secondary Education	172
Education for Selection	172
Education for Intellectual Selection and for National Culture	184
Education and Character-Formation	197
Education for an Intelligent Democracy	211
International Understanding and the Schools	228

tion, but the history of education analyzes and explains the problems of education up to the threshold of the period in which we are working. Principles of education and even philosophy of education have in general dealt with one portion of the whole field, while educational sociology is virtually a new branch and somewhat uncertain in its content.

The study of comparative education fulfills most of the requirements that are needed to justify its introduction as a serious branch of the study of education in general. The history of American education in the nineteenth century shows, of course, marked traces both of the study and of the influences of foreign educational systems. How valuable such study was in the upbuilding of the American system it is unnecessary to emphasize here. Nor is it intended to derogate in any way from the overwhelmingly important part that purely native thought and development have played in making the educational system of the United States what it is. The point is, however, that in education it has not been possible to divest ourselves of interest in what was going on in the rest of the world.

And yet, although the leaders of educational thought followed developments abroad, comparative education was not crystallized into an independent study. The reason is not difficult to find. In the first place, the usual accounts of foreign educational systems were mere descriptions of administration, organization, and practices. In the second place, such descriptions were written wholly from the point of view of education alone, without any closely reasoned analysis of what the systems stood for or represented in the field of national progress and development. In the third place, either the accounts were in general not prepared in the light of their bearing on specific American problems, or, if they were prepared with this end in view, sufficient allowances were not made for differences in national environments.

Other factors which somewhat diminished interest in foreign school systems were the awakening to self-consciousness

of our national system of education and the remarkably rapid development of the professional study of education which quickly overtook and soon went beyond the opportunities that any foreign country could offer. As a result of the first cause there developed a tendency to believe that American government and society were so different from the governments and social organization of other countries that the educational systems and processes must inevitably be very different. And yet it is not unusual to find, even within the United States itself, educators from different parts of the country who similarly tend to close their eyes to what their neighbors are doing, because they believe their own problems are unique.

Conceding that there is a small measure of truth in this argument, the emergence of democracies since the War has tended to make the problems of education almost universally identical. There has probably never been a period since the Renaissance when the world of education has been inspired by the same range of ideas, ideals, ambitions, and aspirations. The problems of all thus being closely similar, the study of comparative education assumes a new aspect. Merely to study the educational machinery, the organization and administration of school systems, the curricula and teaching processes, and classroom procedures would be barren. The chief value of a comparative approach to such problems lies in an analysis of the causes that have produced them, in a comparison of the differences between the various systems, and, finally, in a study of the solutions attempted. In other words, the approach demands first an appreciation of the intangible, impalpable spiritual forces that underlie an educational system; the factors and forces outside the school matter even more than what goes on inside it. Hence the comparative study of education must be founded on an analysis of the social and political ideals which the school reflects, for the school epitomizes these for transmission and for progress. Hence, to be in a position to appreciate and

evaluate the real meaning of the educational system of a nation, it is essential to know something of her history and traditions, of the social forces and attitudes, of the political and economic situations that condition its development.

What does this mean for the student of education? It means, if properly conducted, a comparison of variant philosophies of education based not on theories but on actual practices that prevail; it means a critical approach and challenge to one's own philosophy and, therefore, a clearer analysis of the background and basis of the educational system of one's own nation; it means the development of a new attitude and a new point of view from knowing how and why other nations educate. Take, for example, the problem which is today probably the most important, the relation between education and democracy. What is the meaning of democracy? A comparison of the use and significance of this term in England, Germany, France, and Russia—to take only these four countries—cannot fail to throw into bolder relief our own conception of the meaning of democracy and its implications in the United States. The different shades of meaning that attach to this institution have their resultant effects on educational organization and practices. In other words, the greater part of the world today constitutes a species of laboratory in which, so far as education is concerned, varied types of solutions are being attempted to the same general range of problems. Now if it is claimed that education is a science or that we are endeavoring to make a scientific approach to education, the student of education cannot afford any more than the chemist or physicist to ignore the procedures that are being tried under conditions somewhat different from those in which he is working.

The significance of this thesis can best be illustrated by citing some of the problems and questions that arise in the study of comparative education. The first problem to emerge is the eternal question of the relation of the individual to the state and to society. How fundamental this problem

is may be seen from its effects on such questions as nationalism, the content of the curriculum, discipline, and methods of instruction. The changes in education that are now being evolved have their origin in the changes that have taken place in this problem since the War. In practice the different attitudes on the relation of the individual to the state and to society are today more effective and potent than the contributions of the psychologists on the nature of the individual. Educational systems accordingly are colored far more by prevailing social and political concepts than by psychological theories. How else, for example, can one explain the different educational procedures in such democracies as France, England, the United States, and in the young German Republic?

Closely associated with this problem are the varying administrative types, centralization and decentralization or localism. Here there enters not merely the problem of the relations of the individual to society but the whole group of traditions and attitudes that govern the relations between parents and children, between families and other social groups, between local and central authorities, and between a nation and her neighbors. Here, too, enter the status, implications, and effectiveness of a national *Kultur*. The group of problems in turn inevitably affects the problems involved in curriculum-making, discipline, and methods. In no small measure the problems considered in this and the preceding paragraphs affect administrative practices dealing with the support of education, the training and status of teachers, inspection and supervision. And, finally, they affect vitally the conception of progress to the extent that it is dependent on governmental or individual activity, on public and private effort, on uniformity and variety.

One of the most prominent preoccupations in the field of educational research in this country at the present time is the revision of the curriculum. The same statement may be applied to the leading countries of the world. And yet it is

doubtful whether those American educators who protest most loudly the status of education as a science are paying any attention to developments abroad. Fundamentally, the reasons for changing the curriculum are today everywhere the same; the expert in other sciences would surely not close his eyes to the efforts made by others in his own field, no matter from what country they proceed. The same unrest is proceeding in the field of methods of instruction and the relation between teachers and pupils. Here there is a fertile subject for the student who is interested in discovering the truth of the claim that more foreign countries attain greater thoroughness than is found in the United States. But this is only one of a large number of inquiries that may be made into the validity of diverse methods of instruction. At present the only standards that are considered in educational comparisons are those of attendance, length of schooling, and expenditure—standards which are extremely deceptive as guides to quality of education.

In the field of secondary education comparative study can be extremely illuminating. Today it involves a study of the meaning of equality of educational opportunity, a question that is fundamental to the organization of education beyond the elementary level. But more important, especially in view of the criticisms that are becoming increasingly numerous, is the interpretation in the light of divergent practices of the meaning of culture or liberal education. If American practice is different from all others, how can it justify itself?

Another group of questions that is fundamental to the progress of education is that which centers round the teacher. Not the least significant of these is the place of the teacher in society and in the educational system. What should be the character of teacher preparation and what should be the part of the teacher in relation to educational progress? How much freedom should the teacher enjoy? To what extent should his function be to impart a ready-made curriculum, and to what extent may he be expected to be a scientist as

well as a craftsman in education? How much supervision of teachers is desirable and by what standards should effective teaching be measured? What is the place of the textbook in teaching? The implications of these questions for curriculum and methods are obvious.

One more topic may be cited from which fruitful results may be expected from a comparative approach. In recent years the most extensive activity in the study of education in the United States has been in the field of tests and measurements. The work in this field has been almost as extensive in Germany, while valuable studies have appeared in England. A comparison of the results in the three countries, while essentially one for specialists, is worthy of consideration in its effects on setting up standards, in determining problems to be studied, in perfecting technique. And yet, up to the present, the work in this one branch of education, that professes to be scientific, has been negligible.

Finally, there is one other contribution that may be derived from the comparative study of education. This is the development of an internationalism that is not based on emotion, but arises from an appreciative understanding of other nations, from the sense that all nations in education are contributing, each in its own way, to the work of the world, from a realization and understanding of the ambitions and ideals that each nation is endeavoring to hand on through its schools. For a study of foreign education that neglects the search for the hidden meaning of things found in the schools is merely the acquisition of information about another educational system and of little value as a contribution to the clarification of thought, to the better development of education as a science, and to the building up of a comprehensive, all-embracing philosophy of education.

It may be objected, and until recently the objection was sound, that the program here outlined is too ambitious and that there is not enough material available in English for the American student whose linguistic preparation is limited

to that language. Fortunately, this objection no longer holds. In the first place, an organization like the World Federation of Educational Associations has through the reports of its proceedings an opportunity of acquainting the student with what is going on educationally throughout the world. An organization like the Progressive Education Association, both in its proceedings and in its organ, is adding to our sum of knowledge on one particular phase of educational activity. More extensive is the literature published and planned by the International Institute of Teachers College, Columbia University. One of the important activities of the Institute is to make the literature on foreign education accessible to American students. The Institute has already published reports on education in Bulgaria, Porto Rico, and the Philippines, and on secondary education in France. It has in preparation reports on recent educational developments in Germany, Mexico, South America, and in French elementary education. The aim of this series is so far as possible to place translations of official documents in the hands of American students. Through several of its students the study of special problems has been undertaken in a number of foreign countries, the results of which will be published in the course of time. Finally, the Institute issues annually the "Educational Yearbook," in which leading foreign educators present reports on their own educational systems; these reports, with the bibliographies presented, open up materials for intensive studies that have not hitherto been available. On the score of literature, therefore, there need no longer be any hesitancy. But ultimately, if any benefit is to result for American education and for the equipment of American educators, what matter more are the methods of approach and the realization that the foreign educational systems are laboratories for the solution of problems, many of which are shared by the American educational system, and that their study will contribute to the development of a philosophy of education based on a variety of experiences.

THE STATE AND EDUCATION IN EUROPE*

THE permanent question in education has always been "Who shall have the control of the education of the child?" The question is no nearer settlement today than it was when first broached from the point of view of political philosophy by Plato and Aristotle. These two philosophers already had before them the *laissez faire* practice of the Athenians, up to the period of military training, and the state-controlled system of the Spartans. Into the theoretical solutions of Plato and Aristotle it is not necessary to enter, but Aristotle's statement is pertinent to the topic under consideration. "Of all things that I have mentioned," he said, "that which contributes most to the permanence of constitutions is the adaptation of education to the form of government" (*Politics*), and "We laid it down that the end of politics is the highest good; and there is nothing that this science takes so much pains with as producing a certain character in the citizens, that is, making them good and able to do fine actions" (*Ethics*).

To these statements later developments have had little to add. During the medieval period education was controlled by the Church and from time to time decrees were issued requiring parish priests to provide and supervise elementary education; secondary education was definitely controlled and

* Lecture in a course on Contemporary Educational Movements Abroad, Teachers College, March 4, 1930; printed in *Teachers College Record*, Vol. XXXI, No. 8, May, 1930, pp. 721 ff.

supervised by the bishops in each diocese. Attempts were made from time to time by individuals to contest this supervision and by city councils to provide their own education, but these protests against an established doctrine failed. The Reformation did not result in the elimination of the control of education by the ecclesiastical authorities but in the development of a partnership between them and the State, for education, like religion, was subject to the doctrine *cujus regio, ejus religio.*

This partnership continued, especially in the field of elementary education, in most countries down to the twentieth century, but the State gradually assumed a larger share of control which increased with the emergence of the political concept of nationalism.

The theorists of the French Revolution enunciated the principle that the child belongs to the State, and Condorcet, while he accepted this principle, attempted to divorce education from politics by advocating an autonomous system of education wholly controlled by the teaching profession. Napoleon grasped the Revolutionary principle and in 1808 issued a decree to the effect that "No school, no establishment of instruction whatsoever, may be set up outside the Imperial University and without the authorization of its head." This principle Napoleon had already justified three years earlier when he wrote, "Of all political questions that (of education) is perhaps the most important. There cannot be a firmly established political state unless there is a teaching body with definitely recognized principles. If the child is not taught from infancy that he ought to be a republican or a monarchist, a Catholic or a free-thinker, the State will not constitute a nation; it will rest on uncertain and shifting foundations; and it will be constantly exposed to disorder and change." [1] These principles have survived in French education down to the present, but for somewhat different reasons.

[1] See Reisner, E. H., *Nationalism and Education since 1789*, p. 35. The Macmillan Company, 1922.

The same principle was inherent in the definitive organization of the Prussian system of education before 1800. The *Allegemeine Landrecht* of 1794 provided that "schools and universities are state institutions charged with the instruction of youth in useful information and scientific knowledge. Such institutions may be founded only with the knowledge and consent of the State." The call to patriotism and nationalism that followed the German defeat at Jena helped to give further justification to this principle of State control over education, which received a more intensive application after 1870 with the growth of political, military, and economic nationalism in Germany. The practical interpretation found its rationalization in the philosophy of Fichte and Hegel and later in the works of the nationalist historians and propagandists. The State represents the realization of reason and justice in social life; in a word the State alone, as an idealized entity above the individuals that make it up, has a mission and a destiny to fulfill and has, therefore, the right to organize that education that will realize its *Kultur*.

The principle of State control of education never took a real hold on English thought. There were among the early socialists a few, like Robert Owen and William Godwin, who advocated the organization and provision of education by the State, but on the whole conservatives were opposed to it and liberals were afraid of it. (Public education developed slowly and expanded by easy stages after the first grant was made for educational purposes in 1833.) The result was the creation of vested interests which had to be conserved when something approaching a national system of education began to be developed after 1902, and a further result has been the constant fear of State encroachment in the process of education.

There thus survived into the twentieth century two main principles underlying the relation of the State to education: First that the State has a right to a virtual monopoly in education, including complete control over all types of educa-

tion, public and private; and second the doctrine of *laissez faire* with the implication that the State may step in to supply deficiencies. Some changes have, however, taken place in the post-War period.

France may still be cited as the best example of centralization or State control in education. Here the Napoleonic principle survives but is beginning to be questioned. The reasons underlying this principle have been increased during the Third Republic. Centralization is justified not merely on cultural grounds but as the best protection against aggression both within and without and the best guarantee of national solidarity. It is not often realized that the French republic still lives in fear of the restoration of a monarchy, a fear which may be groundless but which still plays an important part in French life today. The restoration of the Church to political power is also an eventuality against which centralization in education is regarded as a protective safeguard despite the law against Associations passed in 1904. Fear of the development of a caste system is another element that is employed to justify State control that will hold the balance between classes and provide opportunities for the emergence of talent. Bureaucratic control of educational administration is, from another point of view, regarded as the soundest guarantee of efficiency. Hence, a system of organization in which almost every detail is controlled and prescribed by the Ministry of Public Instruction and carried out by officials directly or indirectly responsible to it. By the time the details of administration have been exhausted by the bureaucracy, so little is left for local school committees, which have a place in the scheme of organization, that many refuse to function. The opening and closing of schools, the provision of a large share of the funds, the training and certification of teachers, the approval of textbooks, curricula and courses of study, and the standards of the examinations with which the career of every Frenchman is paved—all these, the *externa* and the *interna*, belong in the last resort to

the Ministry of Public Instruction. The extent to which the power of any Minister may be carried was well illustrated in 1923–24 when the whole system of secondary studies was changed and rechanged by successive Ministerial decrees.

An appreciation of the principles underlying the State's relation to education in France is necessary to understand the status of private schools. That there is a demand for these is illustrated by the fact that about twenty per cent of French children are educated in them. But no private school may be opened without the approval of the Ministry, the inspector of an academy, the department officials, the local mayor, and the Public Prosecutor. The principals and teachers in private elementary schools must have the same qualifications as those in public schools, and all private schools must be open to inspection. After that, methods and curricula are left to the discretion of the school, an arrangement which does not work out so well in practice because advancement on the academic ladder and at times in the economic field is governed by the possession of certificates granted on the basis of government examinations. It is significant that scarcely any educational experiments of note have come from France.

There is some protest against the system from both lay and professional organizations. There is a demand for regionalism or adaptation of educational organization to local needs, for more flexibility and less control from Paris. Up to the present nothing has been done to meet this demand, except that the latest revision of the elementary course of study leaves to the teachers some room for local adaptation, subject to the approval of the inspectors. If any change of larger scope should be undertaken, it is certain that one other dominating element will not be neglected, and that is such an organization of French education as will not deprive France of her preëminent international position as a leader of thought and culture.

The new German Constitution of 1919 opens the section on

education with the statement that "Art, science, and instruction in them [the schools] are free. The State guarantees their protection and participates in their promotion." An attempt was made when the Constitution was being discussed, and since its adoption, to give a larger place to federal participation in education, but although the Constitution provides for the coöperation of the *Reich*, the states, and the municipalities, enthusiasm for federal participation waned as soon as it appeared that participation would not be accompanied by federal aid. Education, with some slight exceptions, is accordingly delegated mainly to the states. One of the serious topics of controversy, the relation of the State to religious instruction, was settled in the Constitution in a liberal provision by which room was found for denominational, interdenominational, and non-sectarian schools, with the right reserved for both teachers and pupils to abstain from religious instruction in the light of their own consciences. In spite of this constitutional provision this question is by no means settled, although a three-year contest on the subject has for the time being quieted down.

Education is, then, a matter for the State. In Prussia the function of the Ministry is broadly conceived and it has under its charge the promotion not only of education and science, but of fine arts as well, including museums, theaters, and moving pictures. The organization of the administrative system remains unchanged, but the spirit of the relationship between the State and localities, and the State and teachers has changed. Domination and prescription have been replaced by stimulation, advice, and counsel. This is best illustrated by the introduction of the word *Richtlinien* (suggestions) for the previous *Bestimmung* (decree) or *Verordnung* (ordinance) in such matters as curricula, courses of study, and time-schedules. This change in the spirit of administration reflects a complete change in the principles underlying the relationship between the State and education. Under the pre-War theory the State was the repository of *Kultur* and to

that end the state had the right of direction and dictation. The change from a monarchy to a republic has not, as in France, been merely a change in the form of government. The Constitution provides that education shall be conducted "in the spirit of the German national character and of international conciliation." From this has been adopted the principle that national character cannot be defined *a priori*, that it is something that must be slowly built up through education. Another task that has confronted German education is the development of a spirit of national solidarity that will bind all classes of society together by an internal rather than an external bond. Hence, the task of developing through the school the consciousness of a common culture. This raises the question of what constitutes national character and who can define it. Most German states have proceeded on the principle that culture is not one thing alone and that it is not subject to definition by authority. Accordingly, the function of the State is to provide those facilities that would lead to the spontaneous development of national culture through the interplay of the individual and his environment. This explains the substitution of suggestions and outlines for prescribed courses of study. The tendency of the State is thus to allow some freedom and flexibility in the *interna* and to set up standards for the *externa*—buildings, size of classes, length of school term, and the qualifications and salaries of teachers.

Beyond this the democratic state has another function, the equalization of opportunity for the best development of the individual. Little has been done in Germany to realize the hopes of those who advocated the *Einheitsschule* or the common school system. The only installment that has been made has been the federal law requiring all children to be educated for the first four years in the same school. Beyond this the access of bright pupils to secondary education has been facilitated by means of scholarships or reduction of fees. The place of private schools has been regulated by the Con-

stitution; the private preparatory school, the special privilege of wealthy pupils, has been abolished; private instruction at home is prohibited by law; private schools as a substitute for public schools may be established. Such schools, whether elementary or secondary, require the approval of the State, which implies that equipment, curricula, and the qualifications of teachers are not lower than in public schools; private elementary schools may be established only where in any locality there is no public school of the religious belief or *Weltanschauung* of any group, or for experimental purposes recognized by the authorities. Private schools are subject to inspection by the State; pupils may be admitted to examinations for certificates granted by the State, and, under certain conditions, financial aid may be given by the State.

If centralization in France is justified for the purpose of preserving French culture, it may be claimed that the new spirit of administration in Germany aims to promote the creation of a new culture based on individual development in order to produce citizens better able to cope with the problems of democracy and conscious of the common culture on which the new Germany is to be built. Since the attainment of this goal is no longer to be secured through rigid bureaucratic administration and prescribed curricula, Germany has again determined that the best method for its promotion is through the preparation of teachers. Considerable attention has been devoted to the new education in Germany; the most promising effort in Germany at the present time, however, is the new system of teacher training already organized for elementary teachers and proposed for secondary teachers. Here again Germany seems destined to assume leadership; the type of state control that characterized her past will disappear and the burden and responsibility for progress will devolve on the teachers. The new principle on which Germany seems to be building the relationship of the State to education is that of freedom exercised by a body of educational scientists. The results may not be as efficient as under

a system that is bureaucratically controlled, but there will be that progress that comes from the interchange of thought and practice of men and women efficiently trained as the responsible agents for national education.

In contrast with those of France and Germany, the English educational organization and administration seems to be devoid of any philosophy or underlying principles. Like the Constitution, English education has grown up in a haphazard fashion and today represents to the uninitiated a conglomeration of "public" schools that are private, of private schools that receive assistance from public funds, of some public schools that are sectarian and others that are undenominational in character. And yet all constitute a recognized part of the public school system. The long abstention of the State from the provision of education at public expense left the field free for private effort and the gradual creation of vested interests which could not be set aside when the public education system was finally established in all its ramifications and the foundation for a national system was laid in 1902. The apparent chaos and existence side by side of public and private education are justified in English political philosophy. It is unnecessary here to enter into the long conflict for and against State intervention in education.

The English view is that the essence of a national system of education is that the State shall see to it that every citizen is assured of a minimum of education, but the responsibility of providing that minimum of education is placed on the parents who are required to send their children within the compulsory age limits to an efficient school, whether public or private. The minimum of education has gradually increased and the next step will be to extend the compulsory requirement to fifteen and to include in the last four years the elements of a secondary education. Anyone may open a private school without any formality, but legally all private schools for children within the compulsory age limits are

subject to inspection by the State, or the locality, or some other recognized agency. The fundamental theory is that initiative, growth, and personality can be assured only by allowing reasonable freedom whether education is provided by a public authority or by private effort. It is felt that there is an incompatibility between the enforced uniformity of a bureaucratic system and the varied enterprise of a system that is supervisory and advisory. The important national asset to be assured is free experimentation or adaptation to local or group needs in order to secure rich variety of character. Personality tells in education and all obstacles to its development must be removed. The proper ideal seems to be, according to Sir Michael Sadler, "variety set in a framework of national organization." The function of the State is to recognize and, when necessary, aid every kind of efficient and needed school. The well-being of a national system of education as of individuals depends on a blend of authority and liberty, freedom and responsibility. Education is a moral affair and the government cannot claim a monopoly of moral control; while education should be permeated with a sense of national duty, it does not follow that national duty can be interpreted by the government alone. The national organization should be broad enough to include groups of schools representing different convictions, diverse ways of life, and varied traditions of judgment, leaving the choice to the parents. The chief task for the State is to enforce education under the best possible conditions and to let those who will provide it, taking care only that adequate facilities are supplied at public expense.

The fundamental theory underlying English education was enunciated by John Stuart Mill in his essay *On Liberty:*

> That the whole or any large part of the education of the people should be in State hands, I go as far as anyone in deprecating. All that has been said of the importance of individuality of character, and diversity of opinions and modes of conduct, involves, as of the same unspeakable importance,

> diversity of education. A general State education is a mere contrivance for moulding people to be exactly like one another, and as the mould in which it casts them is that which pleases the predominant power in the government, whether this be a monarchy, a priesthood, an aristocracy, or the majority of the existing generation; in proportion as it is efficient and successful, it establishes a despotism over the mind, leading by natural tendency to one over the body. An education established and controlled by the State should only exist, if it exist at all, as one among competing experiments, carried on for the purpose of example and stimulus to keep the others up to a certain standard of excellence.

It follows from this that State control is exercised through the annual grant which is distributed for educational purposes under conditions that set up general standards. But these conditions are concerned mainly with the *externa*—all those factors that make an efficient educative process possible. Through the grant the State is able to define standards for buildings and playgrounds, medical inspection, length of term, qualifications and remuneration of teachers, and the efficient organization of a coördinated system. The State refrains, however, from prescribing curricula and courses of study. Elementary education is defined as that education given in an elementary school, and secondary education as that education appropriate to the needs of boys and girls between the ages of twelve and seventeen. Nor does the State prescribe the types of schools to be established; each local authority is required to draft periodically a scheme for the comprehensive and progressive development of education in its area; the agency of the State, the Board of Education, has the right to approve, but in cases of disagreement on a scheme a conference is held between the local authority and the Board, and if an agreement cannot be reached, Parliament is the last resort.[1] The responsibility accordingly falls

[1] Procedure by scheme is not yet enforced legally; in practice the local authorities submit programs triennially to the Board of Education.

upon the local authorities to "maintain and keep efficient" the schools in their area, subject to the conditions of the grant and the advice and suggestions of the Board's inspectors. A similar responsibility devolves upon each school in which the burden of the conduct of the school, the promotion of pupils, the supervision of teachers, and the making of courses of study falls on the principal.

State grants are not restricted to schools maintained by public authorities; while no private school of elementary grade may share in the grant, private secondary schools that are not run for private profit are eligible under certain conditions such as inspection, general efficiency, and the admission of a percentage of the pupils from public elementary schools free of tuition.

Just as the State does not prescribe curricula and courses of study, except by way of Suggestions and Memoranda based not on theory but on the best current practice, so it refrains from conducting examinations, which are left for secondary education to a number of recognized agencies. Even in the training of teachers the Board has recently abandoned its former practice of examining them for the certificates and has delegated them, with some reservations, to regional boards on whose recommendation the certificates are granted by the Board.

The relation of the State to education in England is thus characterized by flexibility, stimulus, advice, consultation, and financial encouragement and reward. The results are uneven and spotty; as compared with other leading countries England has some of the best schools in the world and some of the worst. The system of education reflects the essential English characteristics—a horror of theory, fear of mechanical organization, and worship of individual freedom as the essential element for the development of character. The best summary of the principles underlying the relation of the State to education is that contained in one of the Board's publications: "The only uniformity of practice that the

Board of Education desires to see in the teaching of the public elementary school (the same applies to any other type of school) is that each teacher shall think for himself and work out for himself such methods of teaching as may use his powers to the best advantage and be best suited to the particular needs and conditions of the school. Uniformity in details of practice (except in the mere routine of school management) is not desirable, even if it were attainable. But freedom implies a corresponding responsibility in its use."

The three countries, France, Germany, and England, thus illustrate three types of state relationship to education—France highly centralized for self-protection and for the maintenance of her cultural preëminence; Germany gradually democratizing her educational system to secure national solidarity through the free development of a common culture, hesitant in the provision of equality of opportunity, and carefully controlling the growth of the private school; and England pursuing her principle of *laissez faire*, encouraging both public and private effort, and on the threshold of providing equality of opportunity to break down class distinctions and to foster a fellowship of mind through a common education. Another type, which recalls Plato's *Republic* and Hegelian political philosophy, is that represented by Russia and Italy, where education is based on the theory that the child belongs to the State. The logical elaboration of this theory in Russia would have led to the withdrawal of children from their parents to be educated from the earliest years and trained in state institutions. In both countries the State assumes that the chief function of education is to politicize the younger generation in accordance with the prevalent political and economic theories of the State. Private schools are tolerated but chiefly to provide an education where the State is unable to do so and completely under State supervision. In both countries one finds the curious anomaly of an attempt to build up an educational system that combines progressive principles with political and economic indoctrina-

tion, which is made possible by the careful selection of the right body of teachers, close supervision, and control of text-books. Both countries today furnish the best examples—Italy perhaps less than Russia—of a breadth in the concept of education as an all-pervasive influence, more effective even outside than inside the school.

What does each of the states discussed expect from its investment for education? In France the aim of education is to secure the citizen loyal to republican principles and imbued with an appreciation of her national culture; Germany looks for the self-reliant, resourceful citizen, active and initiating, and loyal to the principles of the new democracy; England aims to develop the character and personality of the individual on the Platonic theory that if the individual is properly educated, the welfare of the State is assured; Russian education is directed to the production of loyal Communists, and Italian, of loyal Fascists. In each country the aim of the State appears to be clear and education is adjusted to that aim. The time has come when education in the United States must become more self-conscious than it has been. The one enduring aim that has persisted since the Revolution, equality of opportunity, is not an adequate guide for the development of a national system of education. Nor can it be claimed that the other aim, the development of "republican machines" has been satisfactorily met. There has, particularly during and since the War, been much talk of Americanization, especially of the immigrant, but true Americanization whether of the immigrant or of the citizen is not likely to be achieved until there is a better conception of what is meant by Americanism and the fundamental principles underlying American society. Until that is achieved American education is likely to be at the beck and call of new theories, changing devices, and uncertain objectives.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF EDUCATION IN ENGLAND*

"ELEMENTARY education is that education which is given in an elementary school." This, the official definition of elementary education, is characteristic of English administration, a system that aims to secure flexibility and variety, to encourage experimentation, and to set up the fewest obstacles to the development of education that are compatible with a national system.

To the American student, familiar for the most part with the vertically organized system, closely articulated, and with a small minority of the population in private schools, or to the student familiar with the highly centralized and almost monopolistic system of France, the English system offers a striking contrast. At first sight it appears chaotic, untidy, and full of contradictions. An examination will reveal that underlying this apparent chaos there is a definite and clearly recognized philosophy.

English education is not a system but a collection of systems working side by side and all contributing to the main end of national education. It is characterized by "variety set in a national framework." English education, like American, serves to illustrate the thesis that centralization and uniformity are not the essential and inevitable features of national education. A national system, according to the English principle, requires the general acceptance of a na-

* This article appeared in *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. IV, No. 5, November, 1929, pp. 71 ff., under the title "Flexibility Characterizes the English System."

tional ideal, the guidance and supervision of a central authority, and a well coördinated system of educational organization and opportunities, toward which England is rapidly moving.

English children may or may not enter school at the age of three. In a few cases nursery schools are being established that will receive them at the age of two. The law requires all children between the ages of five and fourteen to be efficiently educated and permits local authorities to raise the age limit to fifteen, but it does not prescribe what school a child must attend. The burden is on the parent to prove that his child is being efficiently educated, whether at home, in a private school, or in a public school. In the case of a private school efficiency may be proved by having the school inspected. But even a public elementary school may be denominational or it may be undenominational; in either case both types of schools form part of the public system, the only difference being that the building of a denominational school belongs to a board of trustees and denominational religious instruction is given in it. Even the actual organization of an elementary school into different departments may vary under the same local authority.

The same conditions prevail in the field of secondary education, which may be given in public or private schools, and under certain circumstances and conditions private schools may receive public assistance. In the development of a tradition of secondary education the so-called "public" schools, which today include besides the great public schools more than two hundred schools that fall in the same category, have played an important rôle. These "public" schools, although all are private institutions and although only a few invite inspection by outside bodies, constitute a part of the national system whose place cannot be disregarded.

The flexibility and variety that are characteristic of English education have arisen in part through historical reasons, in part they are based definitely on an accepted philosophy

of government. Until 1832 the government paid but slight attention to education. In that year the first public grant was made from the national treasury for education. Elementary and secondary education were provided through private, voluntary, and philanthropic efforts. The grant mainly for elementary education and for the training of teachers was slowly increased and encouraged the development of greater educational facilities.

It was not until 1870 that publicly elected school boards with the right to levy taxes were set up to provide elementary education, and it was not until 1876 that compulsory elementary education was required. In the meantime, through the science and art department established in 1856, the development of education in science and art was encouraged by the payment of national grants on the results of examinations. It was not until 1900 that a national Board of Education, with a president, was established to coördinate the national efforts for education. Two years later the Education Act of 1902 was passed, establishing the present machinery for the coördination of education by local authorities. In 1918 the powers of the local authorities were further increased and the semblance of a national system was set up under the consolidated Education Act of 1921.

The philosophy underlying English administration is based on the principle that the less interference there is by a central authority, the better for the development and progress of the system. The general theory is that the education of a nation is a moral affair, a matter of personalities in which initiative and spontaneity must be given free play; a national ideal cannot be imposed—it must be lived. There is thus constant opposition to state monopoly and state interference. Public education is part of a competitive system, allowing opportunities for diversity of opinions, conduct, and group activities. The justification for this principle is that out of this variety and diversity come growth and progress.

The principle was summarized from the negative side by

John Stuart Mill in his essay *On Liberty:* "A general state education is a mere contrivance for moulding people to be exactly like one another, and as the mould in which it casts them is that which pleases the predominant power in the government . . . it establishes a despotism over the mind, leading by natural tendency to one over the body." The same idea was inherent in a recent statement of the president of the Board of Education (1926): "They were increasingly recognizing the truth that it was private enterprise, initiative, and generosity in education which kept education sound and healthy. It would be an evil day for education when it all tended to pass under one general uniform state system." And again, "It was essential for all education that it should have a varied, different, and individual initiative to keep it healthy."

The fact is that the English hate cut and dried schemes, thought out and planned once for all. The Englishman prefers to grope his way on the basis of experience and in human affairs mistrusts logic because it is too inflexible. This makes him fear the action of the State as leading to mechanical uniformity. Hence he prefers to rely on the English power to work institutions to suit changing situations. This may lead to a system that on the surface appears chaotic and purposeless, but in practice is full of life and vitality and recognizes the educative value of individualism and voluntary effort. There is progress under this system, but not the kind of progress that implies violent breaks with the past; rather is it based on compromise and concessions demanded by the situation. This characteristic was already noted by Burke as far back as 1790. "We compensate, we reconcile, we balance. We are enabled to unite, in one consistent whole, the various anomalies and contending principles that are found in the minds and affairs of men. From hence arises not an excellence in simplicity, but one far superior, an excellence in composition."

If, then, the English system of education looks like a patch-

work quilt, if no two schools even in the same locality are alike, this is not due to caprice or accident; it is due to the belief that the ways to educational salvation are not one but many. To the mechanical smoothness of educational systems that are well thought out and planned in advance, the English system presents by contrast a ragged edge, but the smooth system needs a social upheaval to produce a change, while along the ragged front of the English system there is always some school, some individual, some authority, that is already pointing the way to the next stage. For this right to experiment, to utilize the local opportunities, to exercise initiative, England sacrifices that uniformity of quality attained in more highly centralized systems. The moral personality of institutions as of individuals must be conserved.

It is characteristic of this system that the whole literature that goes in this country under the title of principles of administration, the principal and his work, school management, is almost completely absent. The administrator, no matter in what sphere of activity he may be engaged, learns his work on the job. There may be certain mechanical forms of routine with which he has to comply, but in general administration is a matter of personality and experience.

If one were dealing with a centralized system, it would be necessary and logical to begin a description of the administrative machinery with the central authority. In England it would be more logical to begin with an individual school, for it is the school that is the unit. It is here the principal and his teacher have almost complete freedom tempered by responsibility to draw up the course of study, to classify and promote pupils, to employ a variety of methods according to their ability and training. There are officials, both local and central, known as inspectors, but their function is less intensive than that of the American supervisor. There are certain norms set up by the professional training of the personnel, by "Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers" issued by

the local and central authorities, and by certain standards of attainment expected of pupils at specific stages of their careers. But within these norms schools even in a given area differ more among themselves than do schools in different systems in the United States. So far as inspection is concerned, the main function of the inspectors is to serve as the chief agents of "cross fertilization," to discover the best that is being done under the conditions of practice, and to bring this information to the attention of teachers, rather than to enforce any theoretical standards.

At this stage we can take up the administrative organization of English education, remembering that the system viewed from the national standpoint includes both private and public schools. For the administration of public schools four types of local authorities have been set up. These fall into two groups—the county and the county borough authorities, and the municipal boroughs and urban districts. The county is the large historical area with which students of English geography are familiar; of these some are divided for purposes of educational and other administration. The county borough is a large city with a population of more than 50,000. Both these areas are entirely autonomous and may provide any type of education from the nursery school up to higher education. None of these maintains a university, but they may levy taxes to grant subsidies to the universities and scholarships to university students. Education is interpreted in its broadest sense and includes all kinds of educational, social, and recreational activities for the welfare of the population, young and adult. The other two areas—the municipal borough or city with a population of over 10,000 and the urban district which corresponds to a township with a population of over 20,000—are responsible for the administration of elementary education. Facilities for secondary education are provided by the county in which these authorities lie, the theory being that the more costly types of education should be supplied by coöperative efforts in the larger area.

The authority for education in each of these areas is the popularly elected council which is responsible for all types of local government, including education. Each of the local activities, including education, is administered by a committee of the council, which consists of elected representatives. In order to secure the advice of persons more directly interested in education each committee may coöpt members, such as representatives of private schools or of the universities or others. The committees vary in size from five to fifty (the London committee is an exception and has one hundred and fifty members or more). The committees have full power in all aspects of education within their competence, except in finance. The council as a whole is the responsible authority.

The task of educational administration is becoming so complex and important that there has gradually developed the position of director of education, who corresponds to the American superintendent. He holds office, as do all public officials, during good behavior. If the quality of a school depends on the ability of the principal, the quality of education in any area depends on the ability of the director of education. The importance of the position has called out men of high academic attainments and of considerable administrative ability, developed not by any system of formal study and training but in the school of experience. Undoubtedly a large share of the credit for the progress of education in England in the last twenty years is due to these officials who have taken advantage of and at the same time stimulated the awakened interest in national education. A large measure of their success has been due to taking a long view of the educational needs of their areas and enlisting public support through the organization of education weeks. The administrative powers of the local authorities are limited, first, by provisions of the Education Act, by regulations covering the amount of local taxes that may be raised for education, and second, by the extent of the local resources that may be

drawn upon. Beyond this the cost of education is shared in almost equal proportions between the local authority and the national treasury, which makes its payments through the Board of Education.

Thus it is on the financial basis that the relations between the local and the central authorities are determined. The theory is that the Board of Education has a certain amount of funds at its disposal for educational purposes. In order to share in these funds the local authority must conform to certain regulations and requirements.

In England the local authorities and the schools are free to do what they please in the matter of curricula and methods, limited only by the ages and psychological stages of the pupils and by the main purposes of the school concerned. This is the implication of the definition of elementary education as that education which is given in an elementary school, and of secondary education as that education which is suitable for pupils between the ages of twelve and seventeen. So far as the educative process is concerned, that is, those things that go on in the school, there is complete freedom tempered by responsibility. The Board of Education issues "Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers," memoranda and reports on the teaching of various subjects, but these are suggestive only. The Board does not prescribe curricula or courses of study. For, according to the president of the Board of Education (1927), "If governments, whether central or local, begin to prescribe to teachers a certain method of teaching, they run the risk of all those evils which we have seen in various forms both in the Prussia of the past and in the Russia of today."

The control of the Board of Education, that is, the central authority, concerns itself with all those factors that conduce to the best conduct of the school and the process of education. Thus the Board sets up minimum standards in such matters as buildings, size and provision of playgrounds, medical inspection and treatment of pupils, qualifications and

remuneration of teachers, compulsory attendance and its enforcement, size of classes, and in secondary education the provision of opportunities and free places. Grouped together these standards concern the *externa* of education. Beyond this the Board of Education does not impose requirements. (Owing to the present economic crisis the standards mentioned cannot always be enforced.)

These standards being set up the Board of Education deals individually and separately with each of the 318 local authorities, since the responsibility "for the progressive development and comprehensive organization of education in respect to their area" lies on each local authority. Accordingly, each local authority is required to prepare a draft scheme for the development of education in its area over a period of three years and to submit this scheme for approval by the Board.

An excellent example of the opposition to central control is offered by the history of the system of development by schemes. The Education Bill of 1917 provided that the Board might refuse to approve such schemes when submitted by a local authority. In the act, as passed in 1918, this power of rejection was dropped and provision was made by which the Board might either approve a scheme or, if not satisfied with it, must invite the local authority to discuss it in conference. In cases of disagreement, the report of the proceedings must be laid before Parliament. There is so far no instance in which this step has had to be taken. This method of conference, discussion, compromise, and settlement is one of the recognized methods of contact between the Board of Education and the local authorities.

Hence the local authorites are left to choose, but they are helped in their choice by the guidance and advice of the Board, based on the cumulative experience of the whole country and stimulated by some financial inducement. This method of consultation is well illustrated by the recent history of teachers' salaries. Teachers had suffered considera-

bly from the shrinkage in the value of salaries after the War. The Board of Education, instead of prescribing the salary scales to be paid by the local authorities, urged the appointment of a number of committees on elementary, secondary, and technical school salaries. Each of these committees, under the chairmanship of Lord Burnham, contained representatives of the local authorities and of the teachers and recommended certain scales of salaries suitable for different parts of the country. The Board of Education then indicated that agreements between the teachers and the authorities in each area must be made on the basis of these scales and that these agreements would then be sponsored by the Board.

Similarly, the Board has recently abandoned its practice of examining students in training colleges for the teachers' certificates and grants these certificates on the basis of examinations conducted by the training colleges in coöperation with the universities, organized in regional groups. Standards in secondary education are set up in the same way by a number of examining bodies recognized by the Board.

The question may now be raised as to what would happen to a recalcitrant authority that failed to comply with such requirements as the Board may set up. There would be an investigation through the Board's inspectors, followed by consultation and discussion, and withholding of the grant if an agreement could not be reached. Two instances in illustration may be cited. About twenty years ago a number of authorities felt the need of establishing an institution intermediate between the elementary and the secondary school. The Board of Education has up to the present refused to recognize these schools as anything but elementary schools and its grants have been paid on this basis. The additional cost, since the expense of maintaining these schools is necessarily higher than that of elementary schools, is borne by the local authorities.

In the second instance a local authority refused to pay the

scale of teachers' salaries allocated to it. The teachers went on strike and were supported by the National Union of Teachers and by the parents who engaged the teachers to conduct private schools to which they sent their children. The local authorities employed such teachers as they could secure and generally with unsatisfactory qualifications. The parents could not be proceeded against because the children were, under the law, being efficiently educated by the qualified teachers. The local authority lost a good part of its grant from the Board partly because of the reduced attendance and partly because the qualifications of the teachers were unsatisfactory.

It is clear that although little has been written on the functions of the Board of Education, certain principles emerge from the practice of administration. Primarily in a country in which all kinds of efforts, public and private, are recognized as contributing in various ways to the making of a national system, its function is to coördinate efforts of all kinds, to link up and dovetail and to allocate duties and powers. It sets up and suggests minimum standards and plans and keeps a record of experiments which are watched and encouraged, often with financial aid. It exercises educational leadership not on the basis of theory but rather by collecting and distributing information on the best practice. Through committees appointed by the Board, through the Consultative Committee, and through its special inquiries department reports are made available on educational practices and policy not only in England but abroad.

One result is that legislation in education never runs ahead of practice but almost invariably universalizes an experiment that has already proved itself. Thus it is probable that the age of compulsory attendance will shortly be raised to fifteen for the whole country. In practice a number of local authorities have for some years past already exercised their powers to raise the age limit to fifteen by local by-laws. Another example may be found in the experiments that are being con-

ducted by one local authority for expanding the scope of secondary education by the provision of alternative courses, not now provided for in any scheme of regulations but made possible by the flexibility of the system and the process of conference, discussion, compromise, and settlement.

The Board of Education is not, however, the last resort in education. The ultimate power is exercised by Parliament, to which the president of the Board is responsible.

In the words of an English administrator of long experience, administration is the task of shouldering the burdens of the teachers, who "should be set free to educate with as few hindrances as possible, not only to give instruction, but to use their expert knowledge and their intimate acquaintance with the children so as to build up that development, moral, intellectual, and physical, which is the aim of education as a whole, intended to turn out citizens efficient, happy, wise, just and good." Hence the purpose of administration is "to enable the right pupils to receive the right education from the right teachers, at a cost within the means of the state, under conditions that will enable the pupils best to profit by their training."

England thus furnishes the best example of a system of administration based on the principle of freedom and responsibility, a principle that is applied to the relations between the central and the local authorities, and between the local authorities and the schools. Just as this principle of freedom and responsiblity is recognized today as the basis of individual growth and development, so in the field of educational administration it has been the basis of measured progress, slow and not in any way spectacular or sensational, but none the less real and vital.

THE MAKING OF CITIZENS IN ENGLAND*

RECENT events in the realm of educational administration and control naturally prompt a consideration of what is done in King George's own country to promote patriotism. One might dismiss the whole question by reminding the reader of the average schoolboy's attitude on the subject as described by Kipling, himself the archpriest of patriotism and imperialism, in the chapter, The Flag of His Country, in *Stalky & Co.* That picture is a true representation of the characteristic English attitude to the cult of patriotism by direction. This is due not only to a national opposition to being told what to think or feel, but, as was well summarized in a recent memorandum on the League of Nations issued by a committee of teachers' organization, "We are naturally averse from any sentimental appeal in school and from any obvious attempt to stir the emotions of the pupils." (*Times Educational Supplement*, June 18, 1927, p. 284). Further, a careful search of the Board of Education's *Handbook of Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools* (1927)—a title which is itself indicative of English administrative policy—fails to reveal any reference to the idea that cultivation of patriotism in the schools is desirable. The nearest approach is the statement: "There is no need for the teacher to turn his lessons into sermons. . . . If he makes history living to the

* This article appeared in the *Teachers College Record*, Vol. XXIX, No. 5, February, 1928, pp. 379 ff.

children, they will learn naturally in how many different ways the patriot has helped his country and by what sort of actions nations and individuals have earned the gratitude of posterity." The English position on the teaching of history and the content of textbooks in this subject both constitute a phase of the same topic, the making of citizens. This first section of the article aims only to present the official attitude on the teaching of patriotism by bringing together a few recent pronouncements on the subject.

Early in 1927 a deputation of the Royal Society of St. George approached the President of the Board of Education, Lord Eustace Percy, and presented the following resolution of the Society: "That the direct and systematic teaching of patriotism, as advocated by the Society since its formation in 1894, should be included in the curricula of schools of every grade as the most practical and effective antidote to disloyal and revolutionary propaganda, and that the founding of chairs of patriotism at our universities is eminently desirable." The reply of the President follows:

> With regard to the teaching of patriotism in schools, he would say, "Yes, of course." There was no need to pass a minute on that. It had been dropped out of the Code for technical reasons, but it had been on the record ever since the beginning of the Board's administration, and it was recognized by all local authorities and, he believed, by the whole body of the teaching profession. The proper teaching of patriotism depended entirely on the individual teacher and the way he taught. Very little could be done by administrative regulations. . . .
>
> One of the things that the deputation had urged on him was ceremonial—the saluting of the Flag. They had suggested that it should be a compulsory condition of a grant, and that the ceremonial should be held in every school. Reference had been made to experiences abroad, but he thought that some members of the deputation did not get the same opportunities of seeing ceremonials in this country as they did on their visits abroad. By some of the displays of physical train-

ing in this country a great deal was being done which compared not unfavorably with what was done in Canada and the other Dominions. When it came to the question of a mandate from the Board, it had always been one of the principles of educational administration in this country that as little as possible should be laid down by the central Department; that the Department, in matters of teaching, curriculum, pedagogics, and so on, should act by advice—by instruction in the sense of suggestion—by the issue of teachers' handbooks rather than by direct regulation. If a general mandate were confined to a question of ceremonial it would do more harm than good.

Examples from other countries were always interesting and had their influence; but if we had a native tradition on which we could build it was better to build on it than to copy other countries. It was not as if this country had not got a native tradition of patriotism in education. With all the experiment of other countries in the teaching of patriotism, their results might be said to lag behind the actual achievements of our old public schools in the turning out of people who knew what patriotism and citizenship really meant. Our public school tradition was something on which surely we should build before we built on anything else. A great deal of the difficulty about building up a real feeling of citizenship and a real practice of good manners in social life in the elementary school was the lack of playing grounds and facilities for organized games. They were dealing with this problem as fast as they could in their great towns. The Board of Education were now revising their history handbook, with suggestions to teachers, and he hoped that it would be out this spring. But, while the present teaching of history might leave much to be desired so far as the general intention and desires of the teaching profession and the local authorities and children were concerned, they could not have better evidence of the interest in Empire matters than was shown in the Wembley Exhibition. They should feel that the interest was there and that it only needed to be brought out by equipping the teacher better and by the better working out of teaching methods. This problem was more important than the merely ceremonial one.

It ought to be clearly laid down by the Board of Education,

by local authorities, by the teaching profession, and by everybody who had anything to do with education, that patriotism was the very foundation of the whole of our teaching in the schools. *The method by which that patriotism was taught must be mainly in the hands of the teaching profession. The problem was mainly a teaching and not an administrative one.* The Royal Society of St. George might suggest to the bodies representing the teaching profession that they should form a joint committee to investigate the matter in order to reach joint conclusions. It was on the agreed conclusions of the people who actually had to do the teaching that progress in this matter must depend. They could rely on the Board to do everything that the central administration could do to assist this work.[1]

At about the same time charges and countercharges were made of the misuse of schools for party ends. Here again Lord Percy's consideration of the problem involved—citizenship, patriotism, and political propaganda—is illuminating. Referring to the danger of using abstract ideas with pupils who are not ready for them, Lord Percy said:

> A teacher's reasoning or arguments will soon fade from his pupil's mind; but a child in whose mind half comprehended words have taken the place of tangible things grows up only too easily a man greedy of phrases and impatient of facts.
>
> This truth applies with even greater force to a far more important subject—the teaching of Citizenship. Let me here repeat what I said publicly a year ago with reference to those passages in the old Code which laid down that the "moral instruction" given in the schools should inculcate, among other things, "love of one's country"—"That requirement is loyally carried out by the teachers in our schools, not because it is in the regulations, but because they believe in it. The public may feel confident that the teaching profession realises to the full its responsibility in this matter and would sternly condemn any teacher who failed in this duty."
>
> But I would ask many earnest people, especially those who are of my own political way of thinking, to consider how this

[1] *Times Educational Supplement*, February 5, 1927. Italics not in the original.

teaching has been traditionally given in our country. Let them take our public schools. These schools, however open to criticism they may have been in some matters, have one undisputed claim on our admiration, that they have succeeded in teaching citizenship to the envy of less fortunate lands. How have they done this? Abstract conceptions of duty and the direct inculcation of patriotism have, of course, had their place in our public schools, but a comparatively small one. Symbols have, no doubt, played some part but Mr. Kipling has faithfully portrayed the uncomfortable shamefacedness of a public school audience before whom a politician thought fit to unfurl the Union Jack. Historic examples have had their influence but it is remarkable how largely such examples were drawn from the story of other nations without much attempt to point their moral. No, at public schools boys have, in general, learnt service and citizenship by personal experience and practice in the sphere of the school itself—by acknowledging the force of venerable school traditions, by carrying out responsibilities as prefects, by practicing coöperation in games, and by observing all the concrete loyalties of school life. There is no respect in which our elementary schools, not to speak of secondary schools, have made more progress in recent years than in the development of this school spirit, and there is no direction in which progress is more important. An Old Boys' Association is better evidence of the sound teaching of citizenship in a school than the most elaborate syllabus of "civics." As I say, the teaching of the duty of patriotism in the abstract is not unnecessary, but every teacher knows how dangerous that method is unless it is confined within certain limits. If carried beyond those limits it may have that deadening effect which, as I have already suggested, all abstract words tend to produce on a child's mind, but it may have even worse effects; it may offend what is perhaps the most valuable characteristic of childhood—its reticence and modesty—and may result in self-consciousness rather than unselfishness, and priggishness rather than loyalty.

Especially, perhaps, in this country do we need to bring children up to patriotism through the performance of practical duties, because that is, after all, the way in which we, as a peo-

ple, have attained national unity. Just because our practical sense of national union is so strong, we have been content with a constitutional language of peculiar vagueness, a language in which any child may easily lose its way. There is, in fact, no subject in regard to which the teacher should be given more freedom than this subject of patriotism and citizenship. There is certainly none in regard to which he should have a more anxious sense of responsibility, for here he must, in an especial degree, rely on his own judgment. If governments, whether local or central, begin to prescribe to the teacher a certain method of teaching, or even attempt to influence him, in such matters, we run the risk of all those evils that we have seen in various forms, both in the Prussia of the past and in the Russia of today.

This brings me to a point on which I feel that the time has come to speak openly and seriously. Nearly every teacher wants to keep political controversy out of the schools, to preserve his pupils so far as he can from "the strife of tongues" until they have learnt to think and to discriminate. It is daily becoming more difficult to do this and I am not sure that we administrators support the teaching profession sufficiently in their task. There is a constant and a conscious effort among a large section of our fellow-countrymen to conduct political propaganda, directly or indirectly, among children. I have already mentioned those who share my own political views, and I am going now to speak frankly about those who do not. That is, of course, a dangerous course for a President of the Board of Education to take, but I believe that, whatever my shortcomings, no one will suspect me of using my position for party ends. I take leave, therefore, to speak with freedom.[2]

One other quotation will suffice to illustrate the general thesis that the foundation on which English educational administration rests is the principle of freedom and a corresponding responsibility in its use. It is often forgotten by students of English administration how jealously Parliament protects the rights of the public. Scarcely a session of the

[2] *School Government Chronicle*, January 15, 1927.

House of Commons passes without the submission to the President of the Board of Education of questions bearing on educational policy, questions often of detail in classroom practice. The discussion of one of these questions seriously affecting the position of teachers which follows is self-explanatory:

In the House of Commons, on February 17th,

Sir Basil Peto (Barnstaple) asked the President of the Board of Education:

(1) Whether his attention has been called to the activities of the Teachers' Labour League in promoting the spread of Socialism among children attending the elementary schools; and what steps he proposes to take to prevent party politics being taught to school children?

(2) Whether he intends to introduce legislation for the purpose of preventing the propagation of disloyal and seditious doctrines among school children, such as described in his speech at Liverpool on 6th January?

Major Sir Granville Wheler (Faversham) asked the President: Whether his attention has been drawn to the Teachers' Labour League; and if so, whether he will take steps to secure that no teacher shall in school hours or on school premises teach or influence the scholars in favour of the policy of any political party?

Lord Eustace Percy: I am aware of the activities of the Teachers' Labour League, but it would be easy to exaggerate the importance of this particular body. Its membership is insignificant and includes a number of teachers who are not now teaching in any school under public control. *I believe the House can confidently rely upon the strong opinion of the teaching profession as a whole to counteract such propaganda. The standards of the teaching profession itself are the only sure protection against evils of this kind,*[3] but I am, of course, prepared to deal effectively with any teacher who can be shown to have abused his position in this way. I do not think new legislation on the subject is required.

[3] Italics not in the original.

Mr. TREVELYAN: How many cases have there been of teachers teaching politics in the schools?

Lord EUSTACE PERCY: I do not think that arises out of the question.

Mr. TREVELYAN: One of the questions refers to "promoting the spread of Socialism among children," and asks what steps the Noble Lord proposes to take to prevent party politics being taught to school children. I ask how many cases have come to the Noble Lord's notice of any teachers teaching any kind of politics in the schools?

Lord EUSTACE PERCY: The question on the Paper is whether the Teachers' Labour League exists in order to encourage such teaching being given in schools and to enable such teaching to be given. In view of the declared objects of the Teachers' Labour League and in view of the declarations at the last conference of the Labour Party in regard to the use of the schools for that purpose, I think the question is fully justified.

Mr. J. HUDSON (Huddersfield): Can the Noble Lord say if the general opinion and good sense of the teachers of the country can be depended on to deal with this matter? [Hon. Members: "He has said so!"] . . .

Lord EUSTACE PERCY: In reply to the Hon. Member from Huddersfield, I confidently rely on the teaching profession, as I said today, and as I said in the speech to which the Hon. Member has referred, but I think public attention should be called to the activities of those who are trying to put pressure on the teaching profession.[4]

No doubt it will be argued that England has a homogeneous population and that this country has the problem of Americanizing thousands of aliens ignorant of the country's spirit, traditions, and ideals. And yet if one reads the above citation dispassionately, it will be seen that the education machine of England could be used for purposes of indoctrination. Indeed, the attempt was made, and here again by suggestion rather than by dictation, to use the occasion of the Wembley Exhibition for propaganda purposes. The failure

[4] *School Government Chronicle*, February 26, 1927.

of that experiment leaves as strongly intrenched as ever the fundamental principle that the best method for developing ideals of citizenship and patriotism is through the practice of these ideals in the great variety of situations that a school community affords.

Since the inculcation of patriotism appears to be so intimately bound up in the minds of superpatriots with the teaching of history, it may be well to indicate, again by quotations, what the English attitude is on the subject.

Dealing with the teacher and learner when engaged upon history, Professor J. J. Findlay in his *History and Its Place in Education* (London, 1923) says:

> "They are concerned with *change of men in course of time;* some call it the stream of events, others the narrative, others the evolution of a nation or a people. . . . The end of the historian is to trace sequence in what he calls the historical order, the order of relationship as one event follows another. His ideal quest is to see the end of a human enterprise from the beginning. The relationship of which he becomes conscious is not merely a time relationship, but a consequence, an influence, a cause-and-effect relationship" (pp. 15 f.). "History, then, is selection, and selection involves sifting and discarding, arranging and relating" (p. 17). "Hence when teachers conceive their mission aright, they realize that the true function of history, as an influence in the learner's mind, is to cultivate what is called the *historical habit*" (p. 24). What of the place of history in the cultivation of the civic spirit, patriotism, citizenship, and devotion to public service? "There is no need to point the moral or adorn the tale; if it is a fine tale with the body and substance of fine achievement, he [the learner] takes it to his heart; in due time the seed will produce its harvest. . . . As we follow the development of method through the successive stages of the child's life, we shall take it for granted that the generous relation of material and a wise freedom in method will tap the sources of civic devotion, although on the surface the teacher is only concerned with his distinctive function, viz., to cultivate the historical habit of mind" (pp. 32 and 36).

The aim of history teaching is approached from still another point of view in the *Teaching of History in Elementary Schools* (London, 1916) by R. L. Archer, L. V. D. Owen, and A. E. Chapman. After considering the influences of history study which restrain us from ill-considered actions and enthusiasms, the authors proceed to the use of history for another purpose. "We need also some stimulus which will stir us to right enthusiasms and wise actions. Open-mindedness is a coldly intellectual virtue; it fails to fire the imagination or stir the heart. We need an aspiration, a ground of confidence that our aspiration is based on reality, and the stimulating knowledge that our facts can further our aspiration. All these needs are supplied by the dynamic view of history, by the idea of Progress. It gives an aspiration, for no one can believe it possible that men should become happier, wiser, and better without wishing that it may become true. It gives a ground of confidence by showing that both our own race and the world have in the main moved in these directions. It stimulates us to action because it shows that such progress has not been effected by blind mechanical laws acting from without, but through the thoughts, words, and deeds of individuals" (p. 4).

These views of the theorists seem to be shared by those who are more closely in touch with the practical work of the teacher. Thus the "Report of a Conference on the Teaching of History in London Elementary Schools," published originally in 1911 and reprinted in 1923 by the Education Committee of the London County Council, defines the aims of history teaching as follows:

> "History, in the widest sense of the word, is the record and interpretation of all that has happened since time began, and comprehends all topics. Here, however, the use of the term will be limited generally to the story of man's social and political evolution. In dealing with this vast subject the teacher consciously or unconsciously sets before himself a threefold aim. He strives firstly to stimulate and train the mental

powers of the child; then by means of those powers to bring the child to the comprehension of a certain body, and a particular kind, of truth; and finally by means of this truth to develop in him some grains of political wisdom and some notions of civic duty" (pp. 27 f.). "The scientific aim of the teacher of history is, however, after realizing the impossibility of attaining exact truth, to approach it as nearly as possible, and by training the mental powers of the children to create in their minds a demand for such truth. Thus, it would be well in the course of teaching to indicate occasionally the nature of the evidence upon which history is or should be based" (p. 28). On the third of the aims the Report states: "The deductions which the pupil makes from history are more effective than the organized admonitions of bureaucratic preceptors. Real patriotism cannot be made to order, and we doubt the need, as much as we distrust the wisdom, of such an adventitious aid to loyalty or to political propaganda in the British Empire as a strained interpretation of historical truth" (p. 29).

Turning to the teaching of history in secondary schools, the *Memorandum on the Teaching of History*, issued by the Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools (Cambridge, 1925), quotes with approval the following expression of opinion: "Hence it would appear that, for the average teacher, dealing with the average child (as he must do in ordinary class teaching), the main thing to avoid is indefiniteness and 'sloppy' thinking. But, by appealing to the historical imagination that is in every child, he can endeavor to give an 'understanding of the present in the light of the past,' and apart from the inculcation of useful knowledge, this would appear to be his most immediately practical aim. If we can make our pupils feel that history is interesting, that it has a real bearing on our everyday life, and that it is, therefore, worth while taking trouble to assimilate its facts, we shall have something to be thankful for" (p. 11).

Finally, publications of the national Board of Education may be drawn upon. In the Board's series of Educational Pamphlets, No. 37 (1923), *Report on the Teaching of History*,

it is stated: "History must be defined as the reasoned account of man's evolution on earth; it is nothing less than this, and the small fractions of the process which can come under our review, whether in school teaching or in private study, will gain from a more philosophical grasp of the real nature of the subject as a whole" (p. 46). "In the history classroom there is good reason for making the first serious sketch relate mainly to the history of our own nation, the place of England in the world. If this is given by the teacher with the fuller conception in his mind, it will serve as the best introduction to the later and more comprehensive view of the whole. The pupil is the citizen *in posse* of one of the greatest and noblest nations in the world, and a due consciousness of the value of this citizenship is an essential ingredient in the making of the full citizen of the world-unity of nations later on" (p. 48). "In history, as in no other study, the pupil learns, in dealing with the past, to judge the truth in questions similar to those presented to us every day in the newspaper, in social intercourse, in the actions and characters of others. It is at its best a training of inestimable value both on the intellectual and moral side. The power of testing evidence, of sifting the fact from gossip, of allowing for prejudice, was never more needed than at the present day. Nor was there ever an age when, in the multiplicity of issues and of interests, it was so necessary as now to be able to take one's stand in an impartial position, and, while allowing the fullest weight to opposing views, to hold the balance fairly in the interest of the whole" (p. 52).

The administrative attitude is clearly shown in the Board's Circular 599 on the *Teaching of History in Secondary Schools* (1908): "This Circular is issued for the guidance of Head Masters and Head Mistresses in arranging the course of work in history. It must be clearly understood that it is not the wish of the Board to lay down strict rules as to the arrangement of the course or as to the methods of teaching. This would be, above all, undesirable in a subject such as

history, in which perhaps more than in any other there is room for the greatest variety of treatment." The same point of view is expressed in the more recent *Handbook of Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools* (1927). "[The suggestions] recommend no definite course for adoption, and the history syllabus even for schools in similar circumstances may properly vary according to the capacity and interests of the teacher. It is undesirable that all schools in any particular locality should follow precisely the same syllabus. Each teacher should think out and frame his own scheme, having regard to the circumstances of his school, its rural or urban environment, its staffing and classification, and in the same measure also to the books and topics which most appeal to him" (p. 115). As for history "it has always to be borne in mind that history is a continuous narrative of events bound together as cause and effect, and that the teaching must develop in the child's mind a sense of this community" (*ibid.*). "It is of far more value to give the pupil some idea of the right spirit in which he may approach the study of history in later life than to burden his memory with details which can have little or no significance for him. If the subject is made so attractive that the pupil is constantly asking himself 'What comes next?' and if when his schooldays are over he continues to read and study history, the teacher has achieved his purpose" (p. 120). That the teaching of history may have other values is suggested, but these again can best be achieved by indirection. "In conclusion, there is one aspect of history which is of first importance to the teacher. From its study the mature reader may gain a wider intellectual outlook and a saner judgment, but for children it is preëminently an instrument of moral training. History deals with true stories of real men and women, of actual communities and nations; it is a record writ large of their influence for good or evil. There is no need for the teacher to turn his lessons into sermons; still less should

he encourage the children to sit in judgment on the great men and nations of the past. If he makes history living to the children, they will learn naturally in how many different ways the patriot has helped his country, and by what sort of actions nations and individuals have earned the gratitude of posterity. Without any laboured exhortations they will feel the splendour of heroism, the worth of unselfishness and loyalty, and the meanness of cruelty and cowardice; and the influence of their lessons in history will be at work long after the information imparted to them has been forgotten."

Adopting the moral of these quotations, the reader may be left to draw his own conclusions and to follow them up with a study of the treatment of the War of Independence in English school textbooks.

THE AMERICAN SPIRIT IN EDUCATION*

THE student of American education, whether native or foreign, who neglects to investigate the background against which this system of public education has grown will inevitably fail to understand its real meaning and purpose. He can readily acquaint himself with the organization and administration of the school system, which is after all a simple affair, but to see these in relation to the fundamental bases of Americanism and the American spirit is to throw a flood of light on the picture and to bring out in bold relief its main characteristics. This is in particular essential for the foreign student who too often carries away a blurred view because he is apt to look on American education in the light of European standards. At the present stage of the development of education in European and other countries that are inspired by the recent emergence of the democratic ideal, it is especially essential for the foreigner to understand the principles that have motivated the establishment and growth of the American system of public education.

The characteristic that is uppermost, starting with the period of colonization and strengthened during the Revolution, is the emphasis on liberty or self-determination which has been adopted as the national ideal. Under the influence of

* An address given at Teachers College on April 16, 1928, to a group of German educators visiting America, and printed in the *Teachers College Record*, Vol. XXX, No. 1, October, 1928, pp. 23 ff., and (in German) in the *Pädagogisches Zentralblatt*, 1928, pp. 545 ff.

conditions underlying the struggle for the conquest of the frontier, this ideal was broadened and expanded with an emphasis on individual liberty and democracy. This "vehement passion for liberty," as Bryce called it, led to a clear and well-defined passion for democracy—a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Many of the ideals which underlie American character arose out of the pioneering conditions of the frontier. On the good side these conditions demanded resourcefulness and self-reliance, equality of individuals, and at the same time ability to coöperate for the common good. But the same conditions also gave rise to certain weaknesses in American character, the most outstanding of which are wastefulness of unlimited resources, contempt for experts and for organized administration, a literal interpretation of democracy which too often emphasized the individual's rights and ignored his duties, led to rotation of office and short terms (and often short shift) for officials. Impatience of restraint, law, and government was another residuum of this conception of democracy. At the same time this conception and the slow expansion of the country in small communities westward combined to develop a spirit of localism and a desire to retain the control of municipal affairs in local hands. The tremendous opportunities (*unbegrenzte Möglichkeiten*) of the country developed in the American that restless, nervous energy, that buoyancy of spirit and optimism which are the first characteristics noted by the foreign observer. Frontier conditions again were responsible for another characteristic—the emphasis on the practical and on immediate returns, an emphasis which, on the one hand, tended to look with suspicion on theory and, on the other, developed the attitude that only those ideals are worth while that can be made to work.

The conception of democracy in terms of individual rights had its corollary in the ideal of equality of opportunity, which was only strengthened and reënforced by the mingling of races and peoples that immigration brought to this coun-

try. This ideal perhaps more than any other has served as the keystone of American democracy. All the factors analyzed up to this point contributed to bring about that constant restlessness that broke down conservatism and the worship of tradition, and led to those standards and attitudes that differentiate the American outlook from the European.

What are the American ideals? The first is the ideal of democracy and pride in its institutions. In its practical implications for American life this ideal has as its fundamental basis the emphasis on equality of opportunity, tolerance in religion, politics, and social affairs, and opposition to the restraint of law and custom. With the last trait the foreigner has unfortunately adequate opportunities to become familiar. And if the foreigner can point to examples in which the ideal of tolerance is honored in the breach, all that can be said is that the explanation of these aberrations belongs to the field of social aberrations and that they do not typify the normal American mind.

The second ideal is that of individualism which is at once the result of the ideal of equality of opportunity and its guarantee. But equality of opportunity implies at the same time the duty of the individual to make the best of himself and both demands and calls out qualities of individual energy, initiative, self-reliance, and enterprise. It is this conception of individualism and this attitude to equality of opportunity that have led in this country to the scorn of idleness and contempt for the useless citizen, in a sense not unlike that used by Pericles in his characterization of the good citizen. It is in this attitude that the foreigner will find an explanation of the recognition of the dignity of labor, when he is unable to reconcile the combination of study and the student's earning his way through his period of study, or when he cannot understand the ability of the country to absorb in the work of everyday life the large product of our academic institutions.

The third ideal is the ideal of social and community service which calls for readiness to coöperate for the common good.

This ideal is frankly a latter-day development due in part to fear of paternalistic government, in part to a more recent redefinition of the notion of democracy. The nineteenth century, in America as in England, preached the gospel of the rights and freedom of the individual; the twentieth century already indicates that the emphasis will be on a gospel of individual obligations and responsibility. In its practical implications this means the conscious assumption on the part of the individual of the duty to participate in the common needs of society and to live a life of service and social usefulness.

Reference has already been made to the foreigner's picture of the American as an individual of restless energy. He is also apt to list materialism among the outstanding traits of the American. Such materialism he readily defines as money-grubbing or dollar-mania. It may well be questioned whether the characterization or its interpretations are fundamentally sound. This trait again was a natural outcome of the conquest of the frontier, which after all was only achieved as recently as 1890. Fundamentally, the materialism with which the American is charged is but a sensitiveness to things that touch his own life immediately. The American is still largely occupied, if not with the conquest, at least with the organization of his environment. He does not, like the European, have centuries of custom and traditions that shape his life. He deals with material things and his measure of values is quantitative. If he expresses these values in dollars and cents, he is but reducing them to a common standard that all can understand.

The American is, in fact, imaginative but not visionary; unlike Bernard Shaw, he holds that an ideal that *cannot* be attained "is not worth a damn." His imagination plays round practical affairs and round the daily concerns of life and is limited in the main to ideals that are practicable. If he has inherited anything from his past, it is his constant belief in the perfectibility of man and of human institutions.

He is, as he would himself put it, confronted with a condition to be solved and not with a theory to speculate upon. Money-grubbing and dollar-hunting alone would not account for such a philosophy of life.

It is in such a background alone that one can find an explanation for the fundamental principle on which this system rests—the provision of equality of opportunity in education for all at public expense. This principle implies in its operation more than the opportunity to attend schools; it implies in its practical development, especially in the last twenty years, an education to each according to his interests, aptitudes, and abilities. Another consequence, this time of the imaginative restlessness that has been mentioned, is that the aims and organization of education are in a fluid state of transition and experimentation, not as in European countries to discover new methods for better imparting the traditional culture, but to reconstruct the concept of culture or of liberal education and to adapt it to modern demands and conditions. Undoubtedly such a culture when developed will have to turn back for its justification to the cultural heritage of mankind, but, for the present, foreigners (and, it may be said, many Americans) do not realize that such groping and experimentation, symptomatic of a period of transition, are apt to be misinterpreted and to lead to conclusions not at all intended. This period of transition again began somewhat less than twenty years ago.

Beyond this the foreigner will note that the emphasis in education is not on knowledge for its own sake nor on the amassing of facts and information, but on the use of knowledge for the development and cultivation of intelligence and for training in ability to think and to judge. Because he attaches value to individuality, the American educator starts not with abstract notions of what knowledge is of most worth but with the pupil's own experiences that are to be reconstructed and made over under the guidance of those other ideals that have been analyzed for the development of a

sense of personal duty and responsibility that not only will lead to the development of personality but will result in a feeling of obligation to the group and to society. The American method of progress may be slow; the organization of education may lack the uniformity and smoothness that characterize national systems that are carefully planned in conformity with some metaphysical concept of the state; but in its variety, in its ragged appearance on the surface, it accepts implicitly the notion that society can be no better than the individuals that make it up and for that reason its characteristic emphases lie on the individual and on the ideals of twentieth century democracy, thus linking the educational evolution with the principles on which American life is based.

THE MEANING OF AMERICAN EDUCATION*

NATIONAL systems of education inevitably reflect the history, culture, and characteristics of a country. It is the failure to appreciate this fact that makes it difficult for the foreigner to understand the educational system of another country. Too often the foreign observer devotes himself to an examination of schools and neglects to discover their underlying purposes as determined by social, political, economic, and philosophical factors. There is always present the danger that the foreigner will bring to his observation his own standards of measurement and his own background of experience. And yet one of the most promising and fruitful developments during the last quarter of a century is the active interchange of thought in education. More recently the rise of new democracies and the rapid industrialization of the leading countries of the world have brought about a certain tendency to make a common approach to the problems of education, to which the recent achievements in the field of psychology have also contributed in no small degree.

It is evident to the student of German educational literature that has appeared during the last ten years or more that a change has been taking place in the methods of approach to the whole problem of education. There is undoubtedly a

* Lecture delivered before the Zentralinstitut für Erziehung und Unterricht, Berlin, in November, 1928; it appeared in Dutch in *Paedagogische Studiën*, April 1, 1929, pp. 81 ff.

new orientation that marks a new tendency. An explanation of the underlying principles of American education will bring out certain similarities and inevitably certain differences.

Perhaps the first feature in the educational system of the United States that strikes the foreign observer is the amount of money spent on education in all its different branches. From this he derives the conclusion that the educational system is made possible by the country's wealth. As a matter of actual fact, not more than 2 per cent of the country's annual income is devoted to education. Nor does money alone explain the situation. The reason lies deeper; the educational system is due not so much to the country's wealth as to the public's faith in education and to the fact that the public has a large voice in determining its educational destinies. For the European accustomed to centralized administration, control, and leadership in education it is difficult to realize that, in general, education is a local concern and that in localities, whether small rural districts or large and populous industrial cities, the control of education is often jealously guarded. Not only is there an almost complete absence, apart from slight exceptions, of federal direction and participation, but in most states the power of the central government also is very limited in the control of education. Even though education is legally a state function, its provision and administration are delegated to the localities, often with almost autonomous powers. Hence education has become one of the most serious concerns as well as one of the largest undertakings of local governments. In the absence of strongly centralized and bureaucratic state administration of education the public locally has full freedom and opportunity to show its faith in education and to have the kind of education that is best suited to its needs.

This faith in education rests on the widespread recognition that national progress and individual well-being are best promoted through education. There is on the one hand a general consciousness that the development of national re-

sources and social welfare can only be advanced by the best possible training of the individual; and on the other hand it is recognized that a common education is the best means of welding together into one common nation the heterogeneous population of different national and racial origins. If the problem were approached wholly from this point of view, however, the task would be simple. The task proceeds far beyond the question of securing a homogeneous national group, when it is approached from the point of view of the individual and his well-being. The United States has always had an implicit belief in the perfectibility of man, a principle which has become so axiomatic that the tradition is no longer even the subject of discussion. Such perfection or improvement can again be promoted only through education. Furthermore, the nation was founded on the principle of the equality of individuals and this again, it is felt, can only be secured through an absence of privileged classes and the provision of equal educational opportunities for all at public expense. And so we find that the overwhelming majority of the country's youth attends the free public school provided for and accessible to all and supported out of public funds. Private education is the exception and is justified only if it exists to conduct experiments in education.

The generous provision of educational opportunities, the most striking characteristic of the American educational system, is thus due to a large number of factors. Upon these is built that public faith in education which calls forth the large expenditure of money. Wealth alone could not have built up such a system, had the urge not preceded it.

The second characteristic which also strikes the foreign student is the restless, nervous energy which is found in education as in other activities of American life. We live in a constant atmosphere of impending changes, of readiness to make adaptations and adjustments to meet new demands and new situations. Tradition, which is the foundation on which European education has hitherto rested, exercises little

or no influence. Just as the entrepreneur is ready to scrap an old machine when a newer and better appears, so the educator is receptive to new ideas. The emphasis is always on the practical outcome, on improvement, and on making ideals work. The most marked distinction between education in Europe and education in the United States lies here: Europe has tended to look to the past, to retain a system because it has worked, to worship tradition; American education, like American life, is always in the making, always in a formative stage, and always in a state of reconstruction. All this means that our educators are constantly critical of their own efforts or of the existing situation and always making an attempt to adapt means to new ends.

A further result of this restlessness is that the method of approach to the whole subject of education differs from that in Europe. The European still tends to begin with theory, often idealistic, and then attempts to mould practice accordingly. He will derive his theory of subject values, for instance, partly from history, partly from an idealistic conception of the individual and society. The American educator starts with an analysis of the practical situation, of society and society's needs as they exist today, and of the actual needs of the individual to be educated. On the basis of this analysis he will formulate his theory. In other words, education is thus a branch of political science and sociology rather than of a metaphysical philosophy. Not only is this characteristically an American procedure but it is determined also to some extent by the interest of the public and in the last instance the control of the public in matters of education. The public is willing, because of its faith in education, to pay what may be demanded for its support, but it must receive value for money spent.

This does not mean in general that educational policy is determined on the principle that "he who pays the piper calls the tune." Owing to this absence of educational leadership exercised by a strong centralized authority, such

leadership has had to be sought elsewhere. It has been found in the rise of the expert, now generally trained, administrator, the public school superintendent. The superintendent today is more than administrator; he is largely responsible for the study of local educational needs, in giving direction to new movements, and in determining policy, even though the final voice rests with the local board of education which is more directly responsible to the public. But the superintendent himself needs guidance and advice; these he cannot find in regulations and prescriptions of a central authority. Here again the absence of centralization has led to the emergence of educational institutions not merely for the training of teachers and administrators but for the conduct of research and investigations, for the undertaking of experiments, and, finally, for the more advanced study of education in general. If the local authority is doubtful about the quality of its educational system, if it needs advice on such matters as a projected building program or the financing of education, or if it desires to undertake a revision on a large scale of the curriculum and courses of study, it will invite the advice and coöperation of professional experts associated with the larger institutions for the study of education, private, independent, with more than local experience, who will render an impartial opinion based not on political considerations, or the requirements of bureaucratic standards, but on a rapidly developing and many-sided science of education. In addition to such external advice, many school systems have established bureaus of educational research whose task is to study the local situation and needs constantly and to be ready to give scientific reports and advice to those charged with administration.

The second characteristic of American education is thus the attempt to adapt the school work to meet public demands under expert leadership. This means more, however, than recognizing what the public wants; it means from another point of view the moulding of public demands and opinions. Since standards are not set up by a central agency from

above, the successful superintendent is he who is able to win over his public to new and progressive measures. If, on the other hand, the public is willing to devote money to education because of its faith in it, this faith must be constantly kept alive and increased by taking the public into partnership in the constant reconstruction and shaping of education. If advertising has made big business in the United States, then publicity in many diverse forms has made progressive education possible. The public is willing to pay for education only in so far as it understands its aims and purpose. A central bureaucracy may by a regulation dictate a line of policy; a local system can only be changed, modified, and adapted to meet new ends as the administrator is able to command the confidence of the public and has its intelligent coöperation.

Out of this background the following ideals of an educational system have been developed:

1. Education must be universal and efficient; not only must every child of school age be in school but so far as a science of education and administration can make it possible, such education must yield definite results in the development of the child as an individual and as a member of society.
2. An educational system must provide for equality of opportunity for every individual compatible with his ability and intelligence; in other words, such a system not only cannot recognize any privileged classes but must make special provision to meet the special needs of each individual.
3. Education must assist and stimulate the individual to go as far as his ability permits from the kindergarten to the end of the university. This means not merely the provision of free education but the provision of such a variety of choice and types of courses as will be of profit to the individual and at the same time to society.
4. Education must aim not merely at intellectual development, but must provide for the training and cultivation of character and personality. In other words, the corporate life

and activities of a school community are regarded certainly as of much importance as the intellectual training of the classroom.

We thus reach the third characteristic that distinguishes the American educational system from the European, and that is that all education from the kindergarten to the university, and today to the education of the adult, is regarded as one continuous, unbroken whole without distinction of social class, each stage differing from the other only because of the maturity and interests of the individual to be educated.

Such are the fundamental characteristics and principles on which the American educational system rests, and which have universal acceptance. And yet because of the size of the country, because of the unequal distribution of wealth, because of differences of economic interests, and above all because of the local character of most administrative areas, there is an absence of uniformity and the existence of the greatest variety both of quantity and of quality. But this variety is not regarded as a drawback. It is the very essence of experimentation; it stimulates the spirit of emulation and competition; and it furnishes the bases for a scientific study of education that grows not out of theory but out of practice. The United States is, in reality, in education as in all other social activities, a vast laboratory, a fact already noted some thirty years ago by a great English educator, Sir Joshua Fitch.

If a broad perspective is taken of American education, it is not possible, as it is in Europe, to disentangle elementary and secondary education, for both are governed by the same general principles. The only distinction that is regarded as valid lies in the maturity of the pupils and the differences in their psychological development and interests. It is gradually coming to be difficult to say where elementary education leaves off and secondary education begins, so carefully are the two articulated. From the point of view of educational philosophy and psychology the unifying principle is the principle of growth, each step in the child's educa-

tional development arises out of that which preceded it. From the point of view of method the unifying principle today is that the pupil learns best through personal activity, doing and thinking those things that have first a direct and purposeful meaning for him and second a clear social value. From the point of view of the curriculum and course of study, to which much thought has been devoted in the last few years, there is a general feeling of unrest with subject matter as it has come down to us traditionally and a desire to organize the content of education in terms of meaningful and purposeful activities. In German pedagogy there is an analogy to this movement in the theory underlying *Gesamtunterricht* and *Heimatkunde* at the elementary level, and the attempt to intertwine with each other the subjects of the secondary school so as to form a united whole instead of a series of disintegrated subjects. Hence, both in the elementary school and in the secondary school the American teacher attempts to start with present interests of the pupils, with their environment, and with present social values, not merely as a pedagogical device or as a sort of apperceptive principle, but because it is felt that the function of education is not primarily to impart knowledge but to prepare the pupil to live and grow as a member of society and as a citizen of today. In contrast with other systems it is not too far-fetched to say that the American principle is *primum vivere, deinde philosophari*, although the latter part of the principle may in most cases remain but a pious wish.

It must be confessed that the task has been less beset with difficulties in the field of elementary than of secondary education. The educational requirements of the early years are simpler and more easily defined and are not complicated, as are the adolescent years, by difference of interests, intellectual, emotional, and occupational. Great strides have been made in the last few years by national committees as well as by local authorities in the field of curriculum revision. Here again the methods of analysis in terms of environment

and psychological maturity have been employed. An attempt has been made to justify the inclusion of curriculum content in terms of purpose and real meaning. The procedure adopted has differed somewhat from the recent procedure in Germany. While the American method of investigation has been that of the *Lehrerarbeitsgemeinschaft*, there have been no limits or restraints in terms of official *Richtlinien* or *Suggestions*.

Traditionally elementary education extended eight years, from the sixth to the fourteenth year of the pupils. This was followed by four years of secondary or high school education. Not only has this organization been regarded as unsound because of the difficulty of accomplishing in four years the aims of secondary education, but it has been found to be psychologically unfounded. Increasingly the tendency all over the country is to make the division after six years of elementary education, followed by six years of secondary education divided into three years of the so-called junior high school and three years of the senior high school.

The problem of secondary education is frankly a difficult one in the United States, as it is in all European countries. The one great advantage that we enjoy is that we have definitely incorporated into our system the principle of the *Einheitsschule*. Beyond that, secondary education is still in a formative stage of experimentation and reconstruction. This fact too often escapes the notice of the foreigners who bring to their investigation the traditional aims and standards of Europe that are now some three hundred years old. The period of transition in which we are engaged began some twenty years ago or less and we are far from having reached a stage of equilibrium.

The whole problem of secondary education began with widespread dissatisfaction with the domination of the high school by university requirements. The public that paid for the support of these schools asked itself whether a system of schools deserved support if a large percentage of pupils

dropped out without completing the course and another percentage failed to meet the standards set up. This dissatisfaction led to an examination of the function and aims of secondary education as a whole, whether its aim is to prepare for college and then the liberal professions or whether its broader function is not the preparation of pupils to be of the greatest service to themselves and to society. From another point of view it was asked whether an evolving society can be satisfied with an education that is static and traditional. The student of the history of education will recognize that this form of protest is not new; but while formerly the protest has taken the form of a demand for the inclusion of science or modern languages in the secondary curriculum, in the United States the demand has been made for a far wider range of activities. The aim of secondary education which has been evolved out of this interest is that the school must contribute to the new demands of a democratic society for intelligent citizens in all activities of life, and must develop a knowledge of and an interest in modern forms of social organization. Thus efficient membership in society, which implies not only ability and intelligence to perform one's duties as a citizen but ability to be economically self-sufficient, becomes one of the chief objectives of secondary education. At the same time the school must develop ability to utilize one's leisure time. The school must thus secure homogeneity of ideals and mutual understanding among the future citizens, if the expenditure of public funds is to be justified.

But to the integrative or social function must be added another, that of adjusting the curriculum to the needs of the individual. The provision of opportunities for secondary education at public expense resulted in a remarkable increase of pupils, all of whom were obviously not destined for an education beyond the secondary school. Further, educational psychology had begun to emphasize the theory of individual differences, a fact of common sense and observation; the real contribution lay in a scientific demonstration of dif-

ferences in capacity, ability, tastes, and interests. This simple fact, though recognized in Europe as well as in the United States, was there either dismissed with the statement that an individual who failed had no brains, or else was met merely by the substitution of modern for classical languages. American theory recognized that individual differences implied not necessarily differences in intellectual ability but rather differences in tastes and capacities, and that the question was further complicated by the professional and vocational interests of the adolescents. Hence in addition to the integrative or socialized function of imparting a common basis of culture, the school has set itself the task of discovering individual tastes and of organizing courses to meet them.

Still another factor that helped to break the bonds of tradition and to differentiate American secondary education from European was the abandonment of the argument in favor of the retention of the conventional subjects of secondary instruction that they trained the mind and sharpened the intelligence of the pupils, even though in themselves they had lost any significance for modern life. This argument, the notion of formal discipline and transfer, which really meant that it did not matter what the pupil studied so long as he was compelled to study it, was regarded as having been disproved by statistical method. In its place have been substituted the principles, already mentioned, that the individual learns best those things in which he has an interest and that training transfers only to a slight degree, provided that special attention is devoted to secure such transfer. In other words, subjects *qua* subjects have no particular and inherent value for mental training and are no substitute for meaningful content and good teaching.

There is thus a complete break with the traditional concept of secondary education. But it must again be emphasized that the full implications of the new theory have not yet been satisfactorily worked out. Secondary education consists, with large exceptions where the four-year high school has

been retained, of the junior high school of three years and the senior high school also of three years. The aim of the junior high school, which is closely articulated with the elementary school, is to discover the interests and capacities of the pupils by introducing them to the chief departments of human knowledge and activity, both academic and practical. Education at this stage thus still retains its general character but introduces into the curriculum a far wider range of activities, materials, and content than was possible under the traditional system. The junior high school seeks to give the pupil an opportunity of discovering himself and on the basis of this discovery to guide him in the choice of subsequent studies or occupations. Such manual activities as are included are not vocational in character but aim rather to give the pupil an appreciation of the place of such activities in modern social organization and an opportunity of discovering his tastes.

In the last three years of the secondary school the courses become more definitely specialized either, as in Europe, along general academic lines or with a definite vocational or technical bias. The old question of college entrance requirements has been largely removed, with some exceptions in the Eastern colleges, by the system of accrediting high schools or of certification of students. The secondary school thus remains free to develop an education which is at each step valuable in itself and which because education means growth can allow the preparatory concept to take care of itself.

Two criticisms will inevitably present themselves to the foreign observer. First, that although provision is made to meet individual differences of all kinds, no efforts are made to provide for an élite, for the gifted and talented, those who are to become leaders of thought; that in the system of the *Einheitsschule*, the absence of rigorous selection makes for mediocrity of standards. To a certain extent this has been in part true in the past, but it is not unalterably true for all times. Already steps are being taken to provide for the

more able students,—not, as in Europe, in separate schools but within the same school organization. In any case, however, the United States is not greatly disturbed about either the selection of an élite or the emergence of leaders. Theoretically the élite is expected to emerge spontaneously by having as many opportunities as possible open for variation and differentiation. The system instead of being directly selective is rather distributive, *suum cuique*, aiming to provide the proper type of education for each individual according to his ability. As to the emergence of leaders of thought, the American is not as convinced as the European seems to be that the traditional type of education guarantees the production of leaders; rather would he say that the argument is that of the *beati possidentes*.

The second charge is that the United States is lacking in culture, a charge which is not uncommon, is often coupled with the charge of materialism, and is found even in the country itself. But this charge depends very much on the connotation of the term culture. It means something more than familiarity with the best that has been said and done in the world; it implies beyond that an appreciation of those things that are worth while today and of the meaning of human institutions. The brightest periods in the history of education from the time of the Greeks have been those in which an attempt has been made not to absorb, not to imitate the past, but to adapt education to contemporary needs. This was true in Greece; it was true during the Renaissance; it was true in Germany in the eighteenth century and at the beginning of the nineteenth. The connotation of culture which has become traditionally accepted has been determined by the few who have enjoyed the limited opportunities offered to acquire it and who in general have had no immediate concern with or direct interest in the workings of everyday life. Nor can culture be interpreted in terms of knowledge or science alone. The evidences of culture are to be found in independence of judgment and power to think; in facility of

expression, precise thought, and accuracy; in breadth of interests in life as well as in books; in a social attitude of mind aiming at social improvement; and in an appreciation of beauty and worth.

I do not wish to be misunderstood; it is not my intention to claim that the United States has by any means yet achieved a new form of culture; my purpose is to indicate that a new conception has, at any rate, been formulated and that its practical realization is still in an experimental stage. This new concept must at least be taken into consideration by the foreign student of American affairs, if he is to avoid a misunderstanding of American education by submitting it to standards that are alien to it. The principle, to put it simply, is not that a few subjects, in and by themselves, confer culture, but that culture must be based on the Latin poet's *Nihil humanum a me alienum puto.* Only in this sense can the early Renaissance concept of humanism be restored.

This brings me to another consideration. Because of the constant unrest, because of continuous experimentation, because of great variety in standards and requirements, our theory, though it always grows out of practice, may yet be in advance of it. We are always confronted by the difficulty which faces you in your period of transition and that is the difficulty of making over teachers who have had years of experience along other lines. Our difficulty is further aggravated by the fact that teachers do not remain in the profession long enough, although this condition has improved considerably in the last few years. But in the United States as here the new demands made on the school have led to the recognition that the teacher's preparation must be more advanced than it has been hitherto. This recognition is finding concrete realization in attempts to raise the standards of the preparation of both elementary and secondary school teachers.

Education, both elementary and secondary, is not concerned merely with the intellectual training of the youth. It

has the large task also of developing character and personality, to which intellectual training undoubtedly contributes but only in part. While much is done in the elementary school through physical education and social activities, the work in this direction is more definitely organized in the secondary school. Enlarged opportunities are afforded for physical training and athletics, and for the development of organizations that will promote the well-being of the school and of its members. Room and time are found for a great diversity of activities that are represented by the varied interests of groups of students. Throughout all these activities opportunities are offered not merely for the cultivation of a variety of interests, but also for the exercise of those qualities of coöperation, management, and leadership that are to be valuable later in adult life. At the same time these so-called extra-curricular activities afford an opportunity of discovering interests and abilities which cannot always be probed in the regular work of the classroom. Fundamentally the individual is developed on his moral as well as on his intellectual side through life in institutions. Hence the school, as one of such institutions rather than a loose aggregation of teachers and pupils, has from this point of view a tremendous opportunity through encouraging the development of a social atmosphere, a sense of community feeling, an *esprit de corps*.

Such in the main are the characteristics of American education. There is today, in educational thinking, at least a remarkable similarity of tendency that is the result on the one hand of democratic forms of government and of industrialization, and on the other of the contributions of educational psychology. Much may be hoped from international coöperation in the science of education. An educational cosmopolis can never be attained, even if it were desirable. It is an interesting speculation to attempt to foresee the developments in the next generation—Europe starting with centuries of tradition behind it in education, with a philosophy that is primarily idealistic, and the United States discon-

tented with tradition and with education founded in realism and rejecting theories that will not work, but both arriving at an educational theory that has many points of resemblance. We envy Germany her well-prepared teachers, with their mastery of subject matter; we admire the thoroughness of work, and the quality of standards achieved by the few; in both these aspects we have still much to learn. If we have anything to offer it is the understanding of the child as a human personality and not as a psychological or philosophical entity; it is our readiness to experiment in the great task of adapting education to meet the needs of both the child and society, of using education both for construction and for reconstruction; it is our recognition that the function of education is not only to conserve and hand on the heritage of the race, but to prepare the plastic child to take his place in a changing social environment.

THE EDUCATIONAL SITUATION*

We stand today at the beginning of a new educational era. There is, the world over, greater activity in the field of educational thought and reform than has ever been known in the past. The chief feature that distinguishes this period from all others is the fact that the people everywhere are beginning to take such an interest in their educational welfare and progress as they have rarely shown before. Hitherto education was largely a concern of the governments, of the educational authorities, and of the teaching profession itself. Today that interest is being shared by all citizens in the great nations of the world. In some fashion the American public has always demonstrated its pride in its educational institutions, but it is only within recent years that it has awakened to its own direct and immediate interest in its progress. No educational reform, no great program of educational reconstruction, can be carried out without taking the public into partnership, without extensive publicity campaigns, without the intelligent support of the press and organizations of citizens. This feature, so well known to us in this country, is one that is becoming established in most other countries. The fruit of a century or even less of modern elementary education is a vocal demand on the part of peoples themselves to share actively in the promotion of larger programs. One direct effect of this is that the school today is not merely an affair of providing a building and

* Lecture delivered at the State Teachers College, Durant, Okla., June 21, 1928.

bringing children and teachers together to carry on a process understood by the profession alone. The public today wants to know what is going on in the school, wants certain things done in the school, and asks the reasons for what is being done. This activity on the part of the public is tending to make the teaching profession more than ever self-critical and is lifting the task of teaching above the level of routine and craftsmanship to the level of a profession and almost of a science.

This situation is a common one in many other countries. It began to develop before the War, but has been brought about rapidly since the War. If one were to look for a reason, one would find that the keynote of educational progress today lies in the wider acceptance of the ideal of democracy. But the term democracy may be interpreted in a number of ways; in its general sense it implies a form of government. This notion of democracy, however, may bring about the provision of educational opportunity, as it did in this country, but it need not and did not in practice greatly affect educational practices, curricula, and methods. A fuller and richer meaning is coming to be attached to the term democracy as a form of living. It implies the fullest development of the individual consistent with his ability and a realization of his social responsibility. The nineteenth century preached the gospel of rights; the twentieth century is attempting to preach and to develop the gospel of duty and of social obligation. To develop the individual alone is not enough; to develop him as a personality conscious both of his rights and of his duties, of his place in his own society, in his country, and in the world, is today the great task of education to which the nations of the world are addressing themselves. That is why we are so concerned not only with the problem of what to teach but also how to teach in order to achieve the new aim. That is why the public everywhere is so much more concerned with what is going on in the schools on which its stability and its progress depend.

With this situation in the United States you are all familiar. But the same thing is going on elsewhere; scarcely a session passes in the House of Commons in England or in the various Diets in Germany but that educational questions, some broad in scope, some dealing with details, are discussed; in France Parliament has devoted days to debates on the reconstruction of the secondary school curriculum and the reorganization of the whole system of education. The same development is taking place in local governments. But it is recognized that this is not enough, and that the public in general must participate in the advancement of education and have greater opportunities for intelligent participation than it has ever enjoyed before. In Germany parents' committees are being established everywhere in all types of schools; in Holland they are required to be established by law. Side by side with these committees parents' evenings and exhibitions of school work are organized to define more clearly to the parents what the new tendencies in education signify. In England where the practice of parents' committees is not so extensively instituted, education weeks with school exhibitions and handbooks explaining the organization and meaning of education have been organized up and down the country, with the very important result that a public made more intelligent about education is demanding more education and is willing to pay for its improvement. This recognition that an expanding program of education is possible only with the support and intelligent sympathy of the public is at the root of the remarkable progress made in five years in building up an educational system where none existed before in Mexico.

What are the implications of this new partnership? First that education should be largely a local affair, second that it must have its roots in the local environment, third that it cannot be cut to the same pattern over an extensive area. Education, except in so far as certain minimum standards are concerned in order to secure equality of opportunity, is not

something that can be dictated from above. It must begin with the concerns of the locality, with what the pupils bring to the school, and with what parents and public can appreciate. The teacher's task is to utilize this foundation for the full development of each pupil's personality, to make him into a fuller and richer member of society.

In Germany the separate states, giving up all hope of federal participation, have launched a new educational program, the details of which are being worked out by the localities. A similar movement was begun in France, but financial difficulties have prevented its realization. England has long been the representative of a just balance between local and central control and many local authorities are in fact ready to be more progressive than the central Board. All countries are learning, some quickly, some slowly, that the details of the educational program and process cannot be defined from a central bureaucratic office. England has long and consistently refused to define the details of school practice and in elementary education merely issues *Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers*, a general outline of curriculum and methods, the details of which are to be filled out in each school. The German states, which before the War were highly centralized, have adopted the same practice and issue not regulations on the course of study, but suggestions. This practice is being adopted in a number of South American states, and even in France, still so highly centralized, the most recent regulations permit the teachers to adapt courses to local conditions.

The development and growth of this practice are having another effect. So long as the curriculum was simple and dictated from above, the successful teacher was the teacher who did well what he was told to do. Today, when so much more initiative is entrusted to the teacher, it is not enough for him to be a master of simple formulas on the art of teaching; he must have command of principles, must know local conditions thoroughly, and must have a wider general

training. Hence there is developing a movement to place the preparation of teachers on a higher level. We are familiar with this tendency in this country, where normal schools are becoming teachers colleges and the period of training is being extended to three and even four years. In England the training colleges are being affiliated with the universities, and in Germany some are being incorporated in the universities, some are independent but on a university level. In both countries teaching is becoming more of a profession than a trade, and the time has come when teachers are being entrusted with more freedom to utilize the results of the science of education. Thus in both countries, as in this, elementary school teachers are being given a richer academic background and a better professional preparation than the mere apprenticeship and narrow training that prevailed hitherto.

Three tendencies in modern education have so far been discussed: A more intelligent conception of the meaning of democracy; increased participation and interest on the part of the public; and a higher type of preparation for the teacher. What has been the corresponding tendency in the organization of schools? It is difficult for us, familiar with the unbroken and unitary system of education leading from the kindergarten to the university, to realize that this is the unique contribution of the United States to the world of education. We may discuss whether the system should be on the eight-four plan, or the six-three-three, or the six-four-four, but whatever the ultimate form the system is intended to provide equality of opportunity for all. Every other country, however, has hitherto had one type of school for the classes and another for the masses. But at present no question is being more widely and more seriously discussed in all parts of Europe than that of providing equality of opportunity for all. Everywhere is heard a demand for the best type of education by which the individual can profit, an individual with rights to education and rights to educa-

tional opportunities. But such educational opportunities, it is recognized, are essential for the promotion of social welfare and progress based on the best utilization of individual abilities. The traditional division of one type of education for the masses and one for the classes meant a tremendous loss of talent to each nation. Hence there is a widespread movement for a common school system, with a common elementary education followed by different types of post-elementary education suited to the needs and capacities of the individuals. The movement is only in its beginnings; a tradition of three or more centuries cannot be broken down in less than a generation; vested interests are opposed to encroachments; and even if the spirit were more willing, most countries outside the United States cannot face the cost. But some ground has already been gained; in Germany all classes of society are educated together for four years; in England and France all have a common primary education for about six years; in all three countries the opportunities for poor pupils of ability are increasing, and England is debating the possibilities of free secondary education for all up to the age of fifteen. In this matter of organization, at any rate, the United States has the lead. In another matter also it has anticipated current tendencies abroad—in the provision of differentiated courses after the elementary stage. So long as secondary education is for the few and so long as its function is mainly selective, the demand for differentiation is slight; if secondary or post-elementary education is to be for all, then differentiation must be as broad as possible. This lesson has been learned in the United States; in the solution of this problem, however, the European countries are not likely to adopt the American system. The organization that will probably be developed will follow functional lines, different types of schools serving different ends. It will be interesting to watch the operation of the two solutions of the same problem, the comprehensive high school and the differentiated schools. In any case there seems to be general

unanimity in the theory in some countries, already in practice in others, that the break between elementary and secondary education should come at or about the age of twelve, and that another break should be provided three or four years later. Thus we have still another common tendency dominating the educational world—a demand for differentiated educational opportunities with convenient breaks to suit the varying capacities of all pupils.

If we return again to the guiding principles of modern education, democracy, regard for local environment, and respect for the personality of pupils, and trace their influences on the educational process, curriculum and methods, somewhat the same general tendencies will be found in most of the countries that are now under discussion. Everywhere there is dissatisfaction with stereotyped curricula and traditional methods. Nowhere have ultimate solutions been reached, but this much may be said that experiments are proceeding very generally. In the first place there is a tendency to depart from standardized prescriptions; in the second place attempts are being made to develop courses of study that are meaningful both for the pupils and for society; and in the third place instead of methods of instruction in which the teacher is active and the pupils are passive recipients, efforts are being made to substitute methods that call for activity and initiative on the part of the pupils with the teacher as guide and adviser.

What in general are the causes of dissatisfaction with the curriculum? First, that much has been carried over into present practices merely because it is traditional; because it is traditional and has no valid purpose for present needs, much of it has become formal and uninteresting. A second cause of unrest is that courses of study, as hitherto prescribed by central authorities, have been inspired in part by adult needs, in part by political aims, and in both cases have been conservative and have not made for growth either of the individual or of society. A third reason for dissatisfaction is

that in spite of prescriptions and emphasis on drill, memorization, and examinations pupils soon forget what they have received passively.

Accordingly, partly as an outcome of the democratic emphasis, partly as the result of a better and more scientific knowledge of the learning process, and partly as a consequence of a new philosophy of education which emphasizes growth, the starting-point in the development both of the course of study and of methods is placed in the individual, while the environment in its broadest sense supplies the scope. Education considered from this point of view is the interaction between the individual and his environment. But the interaction is not haphazard; selections have to be made from the environment in the light of the needs and capacities of the individual and the requirements of social living. The teacher is not relegated into the background but is always present to stimulate, guide, and organize the work. To such an extent is this principle respected that in both England and Germany individual schools make up their courses of study within suggestions framed by the authorities but adapted to local conditions.

The curriculum thus has its starting-point in what the pupils bring from their homes, in their knowledge of the ordinary occupations of life, in their gradual appreciation of an expanding world. In other words, the curriculum grows with the expanding experience of the pupils. On this basis methods come to be ways in which pupils react to their environment. Learning is thus based on active participation with content that has meaning and is the process by which are built up a sense of social responsibility, local pride, national consciousness, and a feeling for the common interests of humanity. But this must be emphasized,—that environment includes not merely the concrete local conditions that surround the pupils, not only their own immediate world, but a world that utilizes the realm of ideas, the social heritage of the past, and the factors that have made the world what it is.

Because the function of the school is to develop a socialized individual, it is realized that while the learning process is an individual process, coöperative activity among the pupils and with the teacher and even the parents is regarded as an essential feature of social preparation. This method of activity, individual and coöperative, is emphasized in Germany in all branches of education of young and old, in elementary and in secondary schools, in staff work and in the training of teachers in service. To a slighter extent and not on such a large scale a similar approach may be found in England. May I point out here that these experiments are being made in the public schools as well as in private schools? I should like to submit that the future of education lies with the public schools, provided that they are real, living organisms. A closer relationship between the school and the home, between the school and environment in the broadest sense, a constant awareness both of what man has contributed of worth from the past and what he is accomplishing now, these are the essentials of progress in education. But these imply that other conditions are present—greater elasticity and more flexibility, teachers well prepared, and coöperation between administration, the public, and the teachers. Indeed, what is true of the learning process for pupils applies equally to the adults who are to provide the conditions for their growth.

Up to this point I have dealt with certain tendencies in education that appear to be common. While the present account is limited to Germany, France, and England, many other countries, especially in Northern Europe and some in South America, are facing similar problems and solutions. There is one point, however, of real difference and that is in the field of academic training at the secondary level. There is a general feeling that this type of education should be reserved for a selected group that has the intellectual ability for prolonged study. While some of the reforms in method and content-approach already described are finding their

way into the secondary schools of this type, they are more dominated by tradition than the elementary schools. While greater flexibility is being introduced, the elective system as known in this country does not yet exist. Standards of achievement are probably higher in these schools than for the corresponding group in this country, so that, in general, a student who has completed the course of a German, or a French, or some English secondary school may be said to be two years ahead of the average high school graduate in the United States. Further, the teachers in these schools are men of unusual academic attainments, thoroughly grounded in the subject matter that they profess to teach. But several points must be remembered. First, the pupils in these schools are selected from the start; second, the schools, especially in Germany and France, pay more attention to intellectual training than to what we would regard as more important—the formation of character; third, the standards of selection are progressive and only a small portion of those who enter survive to graduation. The American high school, it must be remembered, is by comparison a young institution; it is the school for all; it has undertaken an experiment which is new as well as unique; it is still in a stage of formation. If we have anything to learn from comparisons it is that no teacher can be expected to teach subjects in which he has had no preparation, nor can he teach a variety of unrelated subjects; we have still to recognize that besides providing educational opportunities for all the nation also has the responsibility of making better provision for its best minds.

What can the American educator learn from foreign practices? From the point of view of quantity, of educational opportunity, and of educational expenditure, it may be true that the demands of democracy in education have been met, if we forget for the moment the thousands of young Americans that still do not enjoy educational privileges of the right kind. The foreigner has watched the American experiment with interest, if not with envy. We on

our side would be blind to the facts, if we ignored foreign experiments and practices. The leading countries of Europe have set up standards of thoroughness in education that may well stir the imagination. While the newer tendencies stress power and activity, the claims of knowledge and information as worthy objectives have not been discarded. While they are seeking to provide variety of educational opportunity, they are sceptical of the possibility of meeting all needs in the same institution. We in our organization tend to cater to the average; the others have not forgotten that democracies need intelligent leadership and have not failed to cater to the best minds. From them we may in time learn whether democratic opportunity and the selection of an élite cannot proceed together.

Education is today moving in the direction of international norms, because the aims of intelligent democracies are approximating to similar standards. Each country in its own way has something to offer to students of education. The United States has shown an example, unparalleled in the history of education, of public faith in education, quantitatively expressed, but the task still remains of consolidating our quantitative standard and converting it into a standard of quality.

NEW TENDENCIES IN EDUCATION*

An English educator said about thirty years ago that the United States is a great educational laboratory. And yet at that time education was still a relatively simple matter. There was not much doubt as to what the elementary or the secondary schools should teach. In the elementary schools the stock subjects were still the three R's supplemented by a few enriching subjects; and in the secondary schools the academic curriculum, with a strong background of the classics, was thought to be enough, as though all pupils in the secondary schools were planning to proceed to college. At that time the child had not yet emerged into his own, and it was enough if he learned those things of which no adult should be ignorant, an aim which is still prominent in the French elementary schools. The faculty psychology which divided the brain into convenient departments, the same for young and old, and formal discipline notions still prevailed. The country was, comparatively speaking, still sparsely settled and the frontier had only been conquered a few years earlier. As for method the five formal steps of Herbart, good for all pupils and all subjects, were just being introduced into American schools.

One wonders what the same English educator would say if he could examine the situation today, with all the uncertainty that prevails on the questions both of what to teach

* Lecture delivered before the School of Education, University of Oklahoma, June, 1928.

and how to teach; what he would think of the tremendous changes that have taken place in the field of educational psychology, and of the methods of social analysis that are being used in determining the selection of subject matter. After nearly twenty-five years of groping and experimenting we stand at the beginning of a new era both in curriculum and in methods. The problems stand out more clearly than they did ten years ago, not only in this country but in all parts of the world where people are giving serious thought to the education of the next generation. Today not only the United States but the whole civilized world is an experimental laboratory in education.

It may be well to examine the causes that have brought about this situation. Perhaps the chief cause of protest against the old conditions has been the feeling that the schools suffered under the tyranny of a curriculum fixed in part by tradition and in part by what were supposed to be the needs of adults. Whether the content was useful or not, whether it had meaning or not, did not matter; the result was that much that was included in the curriculum was distant and remote from the experience of the child and quite irrespective of his interests. Too often the attitude, although not quite so expressed, was to find out what Johnny did not want to do and then make him do it. Teachers poorly trained slavishly followed the prescribed course of study or the textbook, or the suggestions given from time to time by the supervisor. The result was an emphasis on bookish knowledge, on words, on memorization, and on drill, and the supreme test was ability to reproduce what had been memorized and crammed. The question that was asked about a pupil was not, What can he do? but What does he know? Amassing information was synonymous with education, rather than ability to use knowledge and to acquire it for oneself. All pupils were treated alike by lockstep methods and little attention was given, except in the case of the rare teacher, to individual differences. Since all were subjected to the same standards,

discipline was often severe. Initiative on the part of the pupil was regarded as rebelliousness and was punished as such. Pupils were kept in leading strings by the teacher and the teacher by the authorities above her. Questions, if they were asked, were put to elicit answers rather than to encourage the pupils to ask questions in turn and to do their own thinking and discovering. This situation was improved somewhat in the course of time when teachers were expected to make the work interesting, a process which often meant little more than an external coating of sugar to make the still uninteresting subject matter appetizing for unwilling and resisting minds. For some twenty years different efforts were made to improve methods, as though methods alone could give meaning to subjects and content whose value was not appreciated by the pupils.

Such conditions may perhaps still be found in this country —of this I am not sure; but that they prevail in France, and to some extent in England, and were found in Germany until recently there is little doubt. What has brought about the change through which we and others in the educational profession abroad are passing? Of the many factors involved one of the most important is a clearer and more practical conception of democracy and the recognition of human worth. In the nineteenth century the most usual conception of democracy was the political one that every individual in the eyes of the government has the same rights to life, liberty, and happiness. Today it is beginning to be recognized that such a conception alone, while a tremendous achievement in civilization, is no guarantee of social and public progress. Something more is needed, and that is active consciousness on the part of the individual that in return for these rights he owes certain duties and obligations to society and his country in the form of active coöperation and interest in the promotion of its welfare. This can best be seen by comparing the position of the individual in Germany before the War and today. Before the War he was looked upon as a subject, whose rights

were limited and whose chief duty was to accept things as they were, to obey orders from above, and to mind his own business. Since 1918 the situation has changed; the individual who before the War was only an obedient follower is today a voter with a right to say something about the destinies and government of his country; he may in fact be a potential leader in that government. The type of education that he had before the War, though one of the most efficient the world has known in adapting means to ends and in turning out the kind of subservient subject expected by the authorities, will no longer suit the present conditions. It is not enough for him to be a passive listener in the elementary schools for eight years, taking in a quantity of subject matter that he will never use and will soon forget, without any real opportunity to be trained in the exercise of initiative, or a chance to express any other ideas than those put into his mind by his teachers. Germany is not the only country that has recognized the need of a change and a better adaptation to present conditions. There are many countries where, even though the form of government is democratic, the forces of tradition have kept alive a type of education that is almost as outworn as the German. I have in mind here such countries as England and France, and most of the countries of South America. Here class distinctions have prevailed and postponed a revision of the educational principles on which the schools are based.

This new conception of democracy has been supplemented by another principle that has found a place since the War and is a direct result of the War. This is a new conception of the meaning of human worth. It was found that ability is not restricted to the classes and that each country was in danger of losing a great deal by failing to give the best type of education to every individual, especially a type that would call out all the best in him. This danger is not as great in this country as abroad, but we do run the risk of wasting ability because we do not give it the proper scope for its development.

A third factor is the tremendously increasing complexity of life, the existence of so many new situations hitherto unknown, the rapid expansion of knowledge, and the ever-widening range of our intercourse and relationship with the outside world, which affect us whatever our political views may be. To this factor the school must pay attention as it has not done hitherto.

Coming closer home to the influences from the science of our own profession, the changes in educational psychology, which overthrew the old faculty psychology and has substituted in its place a new conception of the mental development of the individual based on the principle of growth, have created a profound transformation in our attitude toward the child to be educated. It has contributed the principle that the child is a growing being full of potentialities for development and not a being with fixed, ready-made psychological categories. Still another important contribution from psychology has led to a complete revision of our notions of the learning process with the consequent principle that learning is best conducted through the activity of the learner rather than through methods of prescription and dictation from without. The one method, that of activity, means longer retention and incorporation into the learner's experience of that which is newly experienced, while the other method, that of passive receptiveness, often means early forgetting. More recently we have learned from the experiments of psychologists that it is rarely too late to learn, provided that the principles of learning are observed and the methods of learning are acquired betimes. In other words, we have from psychology the principle that education is a continuing affair and not a matter of crowding into the earlier years those things that we will need in later life. This means in turn that there should be little place in the school for long deferred values, for content that does not have meaning, that cannot be understood by the learner. It also means that education is a constant process of building on the basis of

experience and of reconstruction in the light of new experience.

This change in educational psychology has been accompanied by a corresponding change in the philosophy of education. The notion that the function of the school is to prepare for adult life, and this by teaching those things of which no adult should be ignorant, has been replaced by the theory that education is life, that every worthy stage in its development is a preparation for life. In place of the emphasis on knowledge for its own sake the new philosophy has substituted the principle that knowledge is valuable in so far as it has meaning for the pupil and can be used. A further principle that emerges from the new approach to education is that the school period must serve as a period of training in social participation and corporate activities, a training that was not given in the traditional system where the organization of the classroom was formal, discipline rigorous, and intercourse and coöperation among the pupils forbidden. Since life in society means a sharing of experiences, the same principle must be used in the school. Thus philosophy of education corroborates the emphasis of educational psychology on activity methods and adds the further notion that these methods must concern themselves with subject matter or experiences that are active or real.

I have so far traced the following causes that have been responsible for the almost universal unrest and dissatisfaction in education: the changing conception of democracy, the rapid extension of knowledge and of world intercourse, the new recognition of human worth, the new educational psychology, and the new philosophy of education. There is another factor that needs to be mentioned, because it brings home the responsibility to all engaged in teaching. This factor is not so much a cause of the changes that are taking place as a direct consequence. The changes that I have indicated all contribute to preach the gospel of greater freedom in education as a protest against the traditional rigor that

used to prevail. But if there is to be greater freedom for the child, there must also be greater freedom for those who are to guide the child, the teachers. One implication of the new tendencies is that the teacher must enjoy greater scope for initiative, more opportunity to adapt her work to local conditions, a more scientific approach to education, and consequently a higher professional training.

My discussion so far has not been based on theory alone. The implications of the several influences that I have described have already been seized in a number of countries, in some entirely, in others partially. Thus England has long given teachers the right to frame the courses of study in the light of local conditions, subject only to the approval of the government inspectors. Russia is experimenting with curricula based on experiences of the pupils, although anything bearing on political doctrines is rigorously controlled. There is in Europe a large international organization whose members all over the world are pledged to the cause of the new education. Germany, after passing through a brief period of radical experimenting, has returned to normalcy and more scientific principles in the reorganization of the curricula and methods in her schools, with a promise of an education entirely different from that which she had before the War. In this country we have our progressive schools and an association to promote their interests, but we have also something on which I pin greater faith and that is an active interest on the part of all teachers, supervisors, and administrators in trying experiments in our public schools under actual schoolroom conditions. National associations, state organizations, school systems are devoting themselves to the cause of reform, a movement in which they have the coöperation of active parents' associations.

It is time now to take up the implications of the new movement, to consider some of its details, and to analyze its merits and defects. From the present point of view it is difficult to disentangle curriculum from methods since the two are ex-

pected to contribute to each other. This type of approach distinguishes the new principles from the old, when method was something that was intended to put subject matter over. Today both curriculum and method have their origin and starting-point in the individuality of the learner.

For purposes of analysis it is, however, possible to start with the important problem of what to teach, of the basis on which the selection of experiences or what we call the courses of study is to be made. Here all that can be done is to give examples of the more important points of view that are found in the educational world. There is one school of thought that would allow the child to select subjects from day to day in response to his needs, the justifying principle being that by meeting present needs we are gradually building up a system of knowledge, skills, habits, and attitudes that will serve the individual when he reaches the adult stage. Experiments along the line of this theory have never gone far enough to give us an idea of what the outcome would be. Sooner or later there comes the recognition of the need of guidance and direction from those whose experience is broad enough to see further than immediate ends. One can sympathize with the child who on being transferred from a school of this type to a school that was less radical expressed her pleasure at being in an institution in which she was told what to do. If there is anything in this theory, why not close schools altogether and leave our children exposed to the informal education, for it is an education of a kind, that they can get from the streets that are so rich in providing experiences and purposes? Are we not all familiar with the parents who are distraught during school vacations with the constant clamor of the child, What shall I do now? Experiments of this kind are not unknown in the history of education. The best known one is that of Rousseau. Tolstoy tried to establish a school along these lines, but without success. More recently the city of Hamburg tried the experiment of the informal school, in which teachers, pupils, parents, or anybody

else who wished might have something to say. The result was chaos for a time until good sense prevailed and definite guiding principles were adopted. It is impossible to get away from the fact that schools are artificial institutions; they do not come naturally; they are the creation of man just like any other social institution, club, or organization, and to that extent must be guided by certain rules. The great task today is to derive those rules as nearly as possible from scientific principles. No doubt the child is entitled to greater freedom than he enjoyed under traditional systems, but in social groups, and the school is one of these, freedom is a relative term, and must be accompanied by a sense of responsibility. As citizens we adults are free, but within limits set by law, by customs, by social conventions. Bolshevist Russia soon learned that lesson; those who expected to enjoy complete, unrestricted freedom, those who expected that the Revolution rang the death knell of established social usages, soon discovered that a new type of social control was imposed on them in place of that which prevailed under the Czarist régime.

So with the school; however much we may wish to protest against traditional rigidity, we cannot get away from the fact that the school is an institution with a definite purpose. The new task is to discover how to attain that purpose and at the same time safeguard the interests of society and of the child. This is the basis on which another and more moderate school of thought is building. It accepts the principle that the life and interests of the child must be considered and be made the starting-point, but it adds that education has the task of reorienting and reconstructing those interests in the direction of adult needs and the requirements of society. Hence it is felt that the child's experiences are too limited to serve as an adequate guide for the selection of educative material. One may even ask whether the average parent or adult has an experience of sufficient breadth. Their point of view is limited either by the interest in their own children or

by the education that may have been good enough for them in their generation. If the situation were otherwise, I myself would see no reason for the existence of normal schools, teachers colleges, and schools of education. But the fact is that education is becoming a profession because study and training are necessary to discover and develop the points of view that are broader and richer than those of the laymen.

Turning again to the curriculum and discussing it from this point of view, wherein does the task of the teachers lie? First to discover the general interests, activities, abilities, and inclinations of children and then to create environments or situations calculated to stimulate the participation of the pupils; but such activities must be selected from the large number of activities that are socially worth while and at the same time have meaning for the learner at his stage of development. Then arises the question, How the teacher is to be guided? Shall all schools be different and individual? It is today coming to be generally recognized that if a national system is to be built up, certain general norms must exist, but not necessarily that all the details of classroom procedure should be predetermined or even the actual content. Child psychology and standard tests and measurements already give us some of these norms. Besides these there is a general tendency in England, Germany, some South American countries, and parts of the United States to furnish to the teachers suggestions and outlines to be filled out in each school or locality through the coöperative efforts of the teachers.

Two further large questions are involved. Shall the child go through the whole process of rediscovering the tools that society has found useful for its progress and development? To answer in the affirmative is not only futile but uneconomical. The inheritance of the race is too precious and extensive either to be neglected or left to be rediscovered by immature minds. There are certain experiences, activities, and processes that the skillful teacher must place before the

child. The second question is how to make a suitable selection from the characteristic pursuits of modern society that will stimulate the growth and progress of the pupils, that will give them the knowledge and appreciation which will make them useful members of society, able to handle situations, sympathetic and tolerant, critical when necessary, and with interests that will stimulate further and continued education. Here again one school of thought, abroad and in this country, would organize the content round a few characteristic centers of interest, such as food, clothing, shelter, health and defense against disease, and coöperation. These centers are built upon the basis of the immature experiences of the child through observation, experimentation, reaching conclusions, research, and independent study. This process of selection and mode of attack mean the surrender of the single textbook and a training in the use of the great documents of life, whether books or nature or social life and institutions.

Another school of thought would take the normal experiences of the child, his interests and relations, the local environment and early knowledge of life activities as he sees them at home, on the street, on the farm, on the way to school. These experiences furnish the basis for numbering, for expression, written and oral, for play and manual activities; and above all they break down the artificial wall around the school. This method of approach leads to excursions and hiking, to visits to factories, stores, farms, markets, and to an ever-widening relation between the school and social activities. But it involves something more; it implies ability on the part of the teacher to make a selection of activities that are worth while, that are progressive, and that lead to the main end of education, the cultivation of a personality with a social sense; it implies a gradual enlargement of environment which has no bounds, for it takes the pupils by way of the printed word into other parts of their country and into the world and back into the past into what we know as history. In many parts of Europe and especially in

Germany you will today find groups of children being taken round by their teachers not only in their own towns and localities, but at a distance from their homes and in foreign countries. A program of this kind gives rich experiences, but they are not necessarily haphazard and chaotic; with skillful teachers the selection is made on scientific principles that recognize the value of the experiences not for the child alone but for society. Nor does this method exclude drill in fundamentals; experience has already shown that deliberate drill is still essential but must take place in real situations.

The point in this movement that needs to be emphasized is the recognition that it is not subjects themselves that are valuable but the social purposes that they serve. Not only is the practice of thinking in terms of the three R's or of other subjects disappearing, but increasingly the approach is being made in terms of ends to be promoted—health, recreation, command of tools, civic and social efficiency. But it must be remembered that without mastery of knowledge, facts, and information, these ends are but empty words.

The curriculum starts with the interests of the child; methods begin with respect for his individuality; their purpose is not to discover the best way for cramming information into the pupil but to release his spiritual ability, cultivate his initiative, and develop a readiness on his part to reach out for himself. Method implies the provision of the proper environment, experience, or activity that will encourage growth through the recognition of aims and objectives, through reaching and making decisions, through testing and correcting results. But this does not mean the relegation of the teacher into the background; she is called upon more than ever to be ready to stimulate by suggesting questions, setting up problems, devising schemes of work, helping to organize ideas, evaluating sources, and testing conclusions, and finally in promoting the coöperation of the class as a whole. Some will ask, Is not this just what the good teacher has always done? The answer is, Not exactly, in so far as

she looked upon her task as one of predigesting subject matter to be imparted to the pupil. The new method starts with the assumption that learning is a subjective process and personal, and proceeds best through the activity of the learner engaged on some task that he appreciates. There is some danger, however, in complete reliance on this method alone. I have seen more time wasted by teachers creating situations, as they are called, and allowing pupils to fumble around in the hope that technique alone would see them through. I have seen time wasted in a similar way in discussions and debates that were mere words, only idle chatter. In both cases the attention of the teachers was concentrated on the method with a disregard for the necessary and inevitable background of knowledge. The fact is that in education there are more ways than one to salvation. The teacher must use her judgment and know when the appropriate time has come for straight expository teaching. There is no danger in telling, just as there is no shame in confessing ignorance. The real contribution that has been made by the new movement is to emphasize the importance of personal activity on the part of the learner and his complete participation in the objectives set up by the teacher. And even here I have a feeling that we may not yet have taken into complete account individual differences and that some of our pupils may profit more from straight expository teaching of content that is meaningful, and others by the newer methods. In any event, a warning is necessary against our characteristic defect of looking upon the very latest as the very best. Teachers should not be too ready to sell themselves to the latest theory, the last device that is preached; but like the good physician they should be diagnosticians, analyze the situations before them, and use whatever methods are most appropriate in the case.

And so we reach the conclusion that summarizes the current movement as a protest against the notion that knowledge alone is power. Knowledge itself is no more productive

than money that lies idle in a hoard. It must be put to work; it must be used as a vehicle for the cultivation of active, purposeful, creative personalities, bringing out the best in each individual in tune with the needs of a progressive society. The school must develop personalities able to use knowledge for gaining and reconstructing experiences, active, sensitive, sympathetic, critical but tolerant, inspired with a sense of civic and social responsibility, because trained to appreciate the meaning of social living, full of understanding for the world and society of which they form a part,—in a word the good citizen in the highest sense of the word.

THE UNREST IN FRENCH EDUCATION*

FRANCE is becoming greatly concerned about her educational system. During the War a number of educators who grouped themselves under the title of *Les Compagnons de l'Université Nouvelle* launched a series of criticisms against the existing educational system with recommendations for reconstruction looking to greater flexibility of organization and an increase of educational opportunities of all kinds. Preoccupied with foreign affairs and post-War settlement at home the governments that have succeeded each other since 1918 have not been able to attack the problem fundamentally. At last discussions both in Parliament and outside, in the press and in professional circles and journals, seem to indicate that the whole question is to be opened up anew. France is taking stock of herself and realizing that she is confronted not merely with an educational crisis but with a number of social crises.

The country is in fact being slowly affected by a widespread crisis which always accompanies a change from an agricultural to an industrial basis. Traditionally France has always been predominantly agricultural. The following figures show that a gradual change was taking place even before the War. In 1846 75.6 per cent of the population was agricultural, in 1876 67.6 per cent, in 1896 60.9 per cent, in 1901 59.1 per cent, and in 1911 55.8 per cent; in 1921 the

* Lecture in a course on Contemporary Educational Movements Abroad, Teachers College, 1928–29.

figure dropped to 53.6 per cent and today is probably about 47 per cent. A change of this kind inevitably affects the social fabric and traditions of a nation. In a country like France, however, where tradition and conservatism are strong and every change is in danger of being regarded as a menace to established institutions, the effects of social or economic revolution are imperceptible, however real they may be. Another measure of the change that is going on is to be seen in the difficulty that France is finding in recruiting her administrative and educational services, especially at the higher levels. The civil service, the liberal professions, and the higher branches of the educational service, both secondary and university, which for centuries could count on recruiting the ablest and finest scholars by severe competitions are not only not exercising the attraction that they did but are actually losing considerable numbers to other careers in industry and commerce. From another point of view France is also realizing with alarm that in the provision of education at all levels she may be left behind by her neighbors. Finally, few countries have exercised the leadership in intellectual affairs that France has enjoyed for several centuries all over the world. Today it is difficult to draw a line between leadership in the intellectual field and political influence. France has her exchange professors and teachers, her intellectual institutes in most countries of the new and the old world. She realizes that any lowering in the quality of her higher education and ultimately of her culture will endanger her international status. The Frenchman refers with pride to the fact that in 1927 the Commander of the American Legion, Howard Savage, in indicating the significance that France has had and still has for the United States, singled out "French culture which has always been recognized as the highest point in civilization."

All these critical points indicate the need of some readjustments in education. In countries where the local authorities enjoy greater freedom in administration and education,

opportunities would be open for better adaptation of the educational system to the changing needs. France, however, still furnishes the outstanding example of a centralized administration. The following statements will illustrate the implications of this system. The first was made in 1876 by the great French educator, Jules Ferry:

> Let it be well understood that the first duty of a democratic government is to exercise incessant control over public education. We cannot admit that this belongs to any other authority than the state.

This principle has been literally interpreted and control has been kept in the hands of the central authority for education, so that in 1895 local authorities were reminded that

> It is not their province to burden themselves with subjects of instruction, the criticism of methods, books, or equipment, since the school programs are today prescribed in full detail by the authorities charged therewith.

Neither of these principles has been modified to any degree down to the present time, so that throughout the country for any type of school, with few exceptions, the Ministry of Public Instruction prescribes the curriculum and courses of study, certificates the teachers, approves textbooks, and standardizes examinations.

Out of this condition is derived the first sign of unrest which shows itself in a movement for decentralization, a movement known in France as regionalism. This means, in effect, the adoption of the principle of local autonomy, local adaptation, greater flexibility, and better adjustment to the local environment. Frankly, the movement, while it certainly exists, is not very pronounced. For a great variety of reasons bureaucratic administration and consequent uniformity of standards have been accepted as desirable by the Frenchman; the critic will shrug his shoulders and say that these are the traditions of the country, but the logic of events

is pointing to a new orientation, the need of which is being impressed on the authorities concerned by statistical evidence.

Under the centralized system virtually the only powers left to the local authorities are the provision of the elementary school and the supervision of school attendance. Obviously such powers are too limited and narrow in scope to attract the services of able men, with the result that in many places the school committees even when appointed do not function. In others the neighborhood spirit and the lack of workers on the farms and in workshops militate against the strict enforcement of the school attendance laws. The result is that one of the most serious problems with which France is confronted is that of enforcement of attendance. At the busy seasons the schools are depleted of all able-bodied boys and girls; in others where occupations are not seasonal young children are kept from school to help in the home, in sheep-herding, or in tending cattle. Accompanying poor attendance is a great variation in the length of school sessions in various parts of the country, in spite of a law that requires elementary schools to be open about ten months in the year. The law further provides that the abler pupils who can pass an examination on part of the elementary course at the age of twelve may be exempted from further attendance of any kind. The results of this laxness in the one aspect of school administration that is entrusted to the local bodies are seen not only in poor attendance, but, what is more alarming still, in an increase of illiteracy. In 1892 the percentage of illiteracy among army recruits, and this includes every able-bodied male between the ages of nineteen and twenty-five, was 8.15 per cent; in 1914 this was reduced to 3.73 per cent, and in 1922 fell slightly to 3.51 per cent, only to rise in 1925 to 4.70 per cent; in 1928 it was estimated that the figure had gone up to 8 or 9 per cent. Efforts to insure regular school attendance have been made for the past twenty years, but obviously without success. In the last few years plans have been considered for enlarging the powers of the local authori-

ties, and more recently it has been proposed that the courses of study for rural schools and the preparation of rural teachers be differentiated from those for teachers in town and city schools. Both measures would mean the introduction of greater flexibility and variety in the national system.

But it is not only in the administration of attendance and adaptation to rural needs that a change is needed. It is significant that the whole of French educational literature can point to only one example of experimentation in elementary education. Nowhere is the character of French education better illustrated than in the new regulations for the elementary school curriculum issued in 1923, the first revision since 1887. An introductory paragraph runs as follows:

> What demand does the reform meet? Has the system drafted by the authors of our school laws revealed itself as defective? By no means. Each time that one reads over the statement in the Instructions of 1887 one is filled with admiration. It is thus not without apprehension that we have decided to apply to this structure the modifications that time has rendered necessary. We have taken care, of course, not to affect the outstanding features, and however important certain innovations may appear, the general tone remains the same. In reforming the institution we intend to remain faithful to the principles of the founders.

The new regulations aimed at simplification of the course of study, and at reducing the emphasis on cramming information into the pupils. But, in general, no great change has taken place in the content or in methods of instruction. It is here that unrest is developing among the teachers and critics of education, which finds expression in a demand for greater freedom, more flexibility, and more adaptation to local needs. The teachers' organizations, while strong and powerful, have since the War been too greatly preoccupied with their own economic conditions to press for a change

that will enable France to profit from the example of the activity schools in Belgium, Switzerland, and Germany.

Demands for the improvement of elementary education inevitably involve a demand for the better preparation of teachers. At present the future elementary teachers of France are prepared in three-year normal schools which are the pinnacle of the elementary school system. In other words, they are set apart from the general stream of higher education. None the less, competition for admission to the normal schools is severe and only about one-third of the applicants are admitted. To meet proposals that elementary school teachers should be trained at the secondary school and university levels, the course of study was revised in 1920 to provide more room for more advanced work of a general cultural character. This reform has, however, failed to quiet the unrest, and the demand that teachers be prepared on a higher general level and in larger cultural centers instead of in small towns has not abated. Proposals are now being made to prepare teachers in the secondary schools to be followed by a year of professional training, or to continue their preparation in the normal schools followed by a year in a university. In either case the present system, whereby every department has two normal schools, one for men and one for women, sometimes with an enrollment of not more than twenty-five students in each, indicates the defects of a system that is organized logically rather than on the basis of needs and flexibility.

It is, however, in the field of post-elementary education that the greatest unrest prevails. Not only are the opportunities limited but the various types of schools do not carry the same privileges. As compared with the three million or more pupils in the elementary schools, not more than half a million pupils and students are to be found in schools beyond the elementary school, and of these about half are enrolled in part-time courses. In the secondary schools the enrollment of boys and girls is only 150,000, and in the higher elementary

schools less than 75,000. Further, fees are charged in secondary schools, and while other types of post-elementary schools are free, admission depends on ability to pass a competitive examination. These figures are disturbing, particularly when accompanied by a realization that many able but poor pupils are denied such opportunities as exist.

As it presents itself, the problem involves two aspects: first, coördination of the whole system, and second, increased provision of educational opportunities for all pupils of ability. M. Herriot pointed out in 1921 that

> Our French educational system looks in its essential parts too much like an ancient institution which has become complicated by additions made at all ages without ever daring to reconstruct it according to simple and modern lines.

The reconstruction that is proposed is summed up in the movement begun by *Les Compagnons* during the War in their demand for the *Ecole Unique*, or the common school system:

> In essence the *Ecole Unique* consists in this: to give to all children at the first level the same education under elementary school teachers. At the age when their development is sufficiently well advanced to make a general discrimination of their aptitudes possible, the best are invited to pursue their studies in the secondary school and if they accept they will be granted free tuition, if they need it.

This statement involves certain reflections on existing conditions. The majority of the French children attend the free public elementary school; a minority attend elementary classes attached to secondary schools which charge fees. The elementary classes were taught by teachers with superior qualifications, they introduced some secondary subjects, and were inspected by secondary school inspectors. In other words, the children of those who could afford it enjoyed advantages in the competition for admission to the secondary schools denied to pupils in the public schools. In 1925 all

elementary education was placed on the same footing, whether given in the public schools or in the elementary classes of secondary schools. All pupils, irrespective of social class, are placed in a position of equality. Only the present prohibitive cost of providing accommodation for all prevents the abolition of elementary classes entirely.

Another implication contained in the statement of *Les Compagnons* is that all post-elementary education shall be regarded as secondary, with various types of schools and courses differentiated according to function. French educators are beginning to think of an educational system of three age levels, primary 6 to 12, secondary 12 to 18, and higher beyond 18. This is the first step, still mainly theoretical, in the movement toward the coördination of a national educational system. Such an organization involves the inclusion in the second level of adequate provision of part-time education for those who do not continue to a full-time institution beyond the elementary school. Efforts have been made during and since the War to introduce a compulsory continuation school law on a national scale. So far this has failed, but special laws require compulsory attendance at continuation schools for agricultural and factory workers under eighteen years of age.

The real battle is being waged around the schools that are embraced in the provision for full-time secondary education. By those familiar with the common high school offering opportunities for study along the lines of the pupils' interests or even with the somewhat flexible secondary school of England, the position enjoyed in French life by the secondary school proper, the *lycées* and *collèges*, can hardly be appreciated. It is the institution *par excellence* which for three centuries has been the nursery of French culture and intellect. It is in the foundation of this institution that France built up her preëminent position in the world of culture. It has been essentially the institution for the training of the French élite. Hence any attack on the *lycée* is regarded with

suspicion as a menace to the very foundations of French culture. This type of institution must be preserved not only as the standard-bearer of French culture but as an inspiration to other types of education.

It is as difficult to describe the function of the *lycée* as it is to indicate its place in French life. With the multiplication of objectives that have been set up for the American high school, it is no easy task to understand what the French mean when they say that the aim of secondary education is *culture de l'esprit.* A literal translation, development of the mind, fails to convey the various nuances of the French words. It implies the development of judgment, discrimination, clear and logical thinking, taste and appreciation, not through the medium of specialized studies but through a general study of the great monuments of civilization, the *études désinteressées,* culminating on the objective side not in mastery of facts and information but in ability to use the French language in clear oral or written expression. Clear expression as the outward manifestation of clear and logical thinking, such is the aim of French secondary education. Whether the option selected by the pupil is classical humanities or modern humanities, the emphasis in both is the same.

Obviously a course of this kind is for the best minds only. It is at this point that the real difficulty has arisen. How to select the best minds, and does society not need the cultivation of more than one type of élite? Confronted with the growing industrialization of the country, France realizes that she must train leaders for all walks of life other than the academic. The problem thus resolves itself into one of providing various ways of preparing future leaders, with the proviso that each pupil is given the type of education that is best suited to his abilities.

The solution has been forced on France, more quickly than might have been expected, by the rapid march of circumstances. For a variety of reasons the *collèges,* which are located in smaller towns, have been gradually becoming

depleted. In order to make the best use of the available buildings and teachers either higher elementary schools or technical schools or both have been transferred to the *collèges*. Thus circumstances rather than theory have led to the adoption of the cosmopolitan secondary school in about one hundred institutions. But France was faced with the fact that in these institutions pupils attending the *collège* section paid fees, while other pupils were receiving free tuition. The inevitable consequence of this situation was the abolition of fees in these schools for all pupils during the first four years of the course, to be followed in October, 1929, by the complete abolition of fees in these mixed schools. Much has already been achieved and in time the complete abolition of fees in all secondary schools will inevitably follow.[1]

The next problem is that of selection. At present most education beyond the elementary is selective on the basis of qualifying or competitive examinations. Even with these tests a great amount of maladjustment still exists. It is accordingly proposed to establish a national system of educational selection and guidance. Already pupils who obtain scholarships may be transferred to a school that best fits their needs. An extensive network of vocational guidance has already been established; on the basis of experience thus gained it is proposed to extend the principles to educational guidance.

Thus France hopes to have at the secondary level a variety of courses with opportunities of transferring pupils from one to another as their abilities and aptitudes indicate the need. Beyond that, with the abolition of fees and an extension of the system of national scholarships supplemented by maintenance grants, opportunities will be made available for children of ability in all grades of society. Poverty is to be

[1] Since the above was written the French Government has been compelled by the logic of the situation to inaugurate a movement for the abolition of tuition fees in all secondary schools. From January 1, 1930, tuition fees have been abolished in the lowest class (*Sixième*) of all secondary schools and will progressively disappear year by year throughout the schools.

no bar to access to the best education that the country can afford.

Slowly but surely France is recognizing that educational opportunity must be provided for all capable of profiting thereby; she is not yet prepared to accept the full implication of the *école unique* which is in the minds of some. For the present she is concentrating on the principle that ability must be selected and trained for service and leadership in different walks of modern society. This is already a marked advance on her practice of concentrating on the preparation of one type of élite alone. The greatest fear that is felt, however, is lest the standards of general culture may be lowered by the extension of democratic opportunities. To protect herself against this danger every effort is being made to conserve the high standards of quality in her secondary schools, to serve as a guide to all other institutions. Thus while she is inevitably borne along the almost universal current that is leading to the democratization of educational organization, she is insistent that this progress shall not be made at the expense of quality in education. So too, she is convinced that the maintenance of standards of quality is dependent neither on the subjects that are taught nor on the analysis of objectives, however detailed such a list may become; but is bound up wholly with the qualifications and ability of her teachers who are sure masters of the subjects that they profess to teach and have a certain assurance and confidence in the work that they are called upon to perform. Quality, then, with a gradual increase of quantity is at present, as it always has been, the ideal of secondary education in France: today the notion of secondary education is to be expanded but is to be governed by the same ideal. The French attitude is well defined in a recent statement (1927) of M. Herriot, who cannot be accused of harboring undemocratic tendencies:

> Our task is in fact constantly to create an *élite*. I, for my part, feel that keenly. At a time when other forces, less noble,

seek to establish themselves, the educational system has the glorious privilege of maintaining the prestige of the mind, the sovereignty and independence of the idea. It has the duty of courageously teaching democracies that no greater danger menaces them than to misunderstand the place of the *élite* or, in other words, the danger of leveling downwards. Our system, by examinations, by competitions, maintains the most justifiable system of recruiting. But a Minister, more convinced than anyone else of the need of an aristocracy of intellect, cannot defend with all the conviction that is necessary the institution with whose direction he is charged without making an effort . . . to facilitate the access of all elements to the ranks of the *élite*. Is it not in the educational system that the republican ideal must be first realized and thence spread through the whole state?

NATIONALISM AND EDUCATION IN ITALY*

LIKE all other countries engaged in the War, Italy early began to feel dissatisfied with her educational system and before the War came to a close, in June, 1918, a commission was appointed to investigate and make recommendations. The task of reform began in 1920–21 under Benedetto Croce as Minister of Public Instruction, but political changes, and perhaps lack of conviction as to purpose, prevented any sweeping reforms. It needed the inspiration of a complete political revolution to furnish the impetus that was required in Italy for really fundamental reorganization of her system of education. This stimulus and inspiration were supplied by Fascism, which questioned the whole political basis on which Italy had been built up since the *Risorgimento*.

Fascism is more than a political movement; like Bolshevism it affects every aspect of individual, social, political, economic, and cultural life. It has sought to awaken the racial and national instinct of Italy and to revive a living consciousness of her glorious past, when Rome and Italy were the cultural and political centers of the world. Inspiration for reorganization in the present and for preparation in the future was to be sought in the living sources of her traditions, just as these have been an inspiration to other nations in the past. The recognition of this common origin of Italian life and culture would assure that unity

* Lecture delivered in Schoolmen's Week, University of Pennsylvania, March 14, 1929, and printed in the *Educational Outlook*, Vol. IV, No. 2, January, 1930.

and solidarity as a nation of which Italians stand so greatly in need.

Fascism is also a challenge to the modern development of democracy. It is in fact a protest against the ideals of democratic government which had their roots in the Protestant Reformation and the French Revolution. These ideals, since they placed the individual on a pedestal, imply a mechanical and atomistic conception of the state and of society, and the view that both are merely the sum total of the individuals that make them up. From this point of view the state and society exist for the sake of the individuals that compose them and the ends of both are determined by the ends of the individuals. Such a form of society is purely materialistic and exists from generation to generation; the present is isolated from the past, and the spiritual inheritances of the past that make for the spiritual unity of society are rejected. The state or society exists merely as a means of promoting the happiness of the individual, and the essence of social or political life is liberty, not sacrifice or discipline or duty.

Against this ideology Fascism opposes the view that society is more than the sum of the individuals that compose it, that it is a succession of generations, and that it has ends of its own which may even be in conflict with those of the individual. These ends are spiritual and involve language, culture, religion, customs, feelings and volition, economic interests, living conditions, and territory. As opposed to the atomistic and mechanistic concept of society Fascism sets up an organic and historic concept of society with a life and scope of its own over and above that of the individual. Society thus becomes the end and the individuals the means or instruments that may be employed to attain the ends. Liberty is a concession from society or the state; the highest ethical value lies in the preëminence of duty. Hence sovereignty rests not with the individuals or their elected representatives but with the men capable of rising above their own immediate

private interests and of realizing the aspirations of society as a whole, as a unity, and in relation to its past, present, and future. Fascism seeks to rescue the state from the individual and to emphasize authority, social obligations, and subordination to a hierarchy that constitutes the government.

To those familiar with the Hegelian philosophy of the state there is nothing that is novel in this theory, which is in many respects similar to that on which the pre-War social and political philosophy of Prussia was based. The essential difference was that Prussia was dominated by a monarch, while Italy is dominated by a party. Fascism found Italy disunited, its political leaders vacillating, the country robbed of the fruits of victory, the people restless, discontented, and on the brink of revolution. The causes were attributed to an exaggerated emphasis on representative government and individualism, to lack of social control, and to the absence of thoroughgoing, animating ideals. When the Fascist party had obtained control, repression was the only method by which opponents who were ignorant of or misunderstood its ideals could be controlled. The future lay, however, with the younger generation; with them education was to take the place of repression.

The reform of education inevitably became a part of the Fascist program. The task was entrusted in 1922 to Gentile as Minister of Public Instruction. Gentile enjoyed the position of one of the leading philosophers of the country, a critic of the educational system, and above all one of the two leaders who had rallied about them the younger Italian intellectuals in a movement of protest against the literary and intellectual stagnation of the country. For this group the stage for a return to Italian tradition and a breaking away from weak imitations of foreign culture had already been set.

In his task of educational reform Gentile was confronted by a system that was defective from almost every point of view. The administrative organization was loose; there was everywhere a lack of schools; school attendance was poor

and averaged only 65 per cent of the enrollment; the average percentage of illiteracy for the country as a whole was 31 per cent and ranged from 7 per cent in Piedmont to 53 per cent in Calabria; the elementary school curriculum was dominated by one aim only, that of imparting information; discipline among the teaching personnel was unsatisfactory; and, finally, the secondary schools which looked only to preparing students for the universities produced an excess of intellectuals who could not be absorbed in the everyday work of the country, under a system in which examination standards were nearly as numerous as the schools. The educational system instead of combating the national weaknesses only intensified them.

The first task that was undertaken was to establish a strong and efficient system of administration. The principle upon which this reform proceeded was, as might be expected from the political principles of Fascism, to centralize all activities in the Ministry of Public Instruction, since education is a state concern and exists in the interests of the state. The excessive number of officials in the central office was reduced and the organization was systematized to promote the greatest degree of efficiency. The Minister himself is endowed with more power and responsibility for the conduct of the whole system; from him and his office flow all the powers enjoyed by his subordinates in the administrative service.

For local administration the seventy-five provincial authorities have been abolished and their place has been taken by nineteen regions corresponding to the historical divisions of Italy, with their own needs and characteristics. At the head of these regions is the superintendent, *il Provveditore*, who is at once the representative of the central authority and the leader of the region responsible for the adaptation of education to local needs. Appointed himself by the Minister, he is assisted by inspectors and supervisors who are selected by competitive examinations, and by advisory councils on matters of education and discipline, the members of which are

also appointed by the Minister. There is thus no provision for any elected bodies representing the public; administration is wholly in the hands of a bureaucracy of experts. All authority emanates from the central Ministry, but centralization is tempered by decentralization, a contradiction which is more apparent than real, since the state controls the appointment of those to whom it entrusts local administration. The fundamental laws and regulations are laid down by the Ministry; the details only are defined by the regional superintendent. Further, if control through an excessive number of officials has been reduced in the interests of economy and efficiency, control through a rigorous system of qualifying and competitive examinations has been increased. Local or municipal autonomy in education has virtually disappeared; only 264 out of the 8,354 municipalities claimed the privilege of administering their own educational systems, but even in such circumstances supervision is exercised by the regional superintendent.

In the organization of education the two most serious problems that were attacked were (1) the provision of an adequate number of elementary schools to give an appropriate education to the masses, and (2) the establishment of a system of secondary education for the proper selection and preparation of leaders not merely for the universities and liberal professions but for all walks of life. In view of the great task involved in the provision of an adequate number of schools and the liquidation of illiteracy, the state has been unable to cope with it alone. It has accordingly encouraged the efforts of voluntary associations to supply schools, especially in the rural and sparsely populated areas. There are thus three types of elementary schools—the classified schools in cities and small towns maintained by the locality or the state; provisional schools with an enrollment between fifteen and forty, provided by the locality or the associations and aided by the state; and subsidized schools with an enrollment of five to fifteen pupils, taught by uncertified teachers and

also receiving state aid. Thus state, local, and private effort coöperate in the provision of schools. The age limit for school attendance has been raised by law to fourteen, but the realization of this law is a hope rather than a fact.

The essence of the reform does not lie, however, in the provision of schools but in the complete change of spirit. Hitherto the emphasis has been on teaching the minimum essentials in the fundamentals of education. Knowledge as an end has been abandoned and in its place is put spiritual education. The aim of education is to create an environment for the development of the spirit of the pupil in agreement with the spirit, the history, and the destinies of his country. The function of instruction is not to impart facts and information from books but to put the pupil in a position to realize himself through contact with the life of the people and the traditional values of the nation—moral, religious, civic, and national. The only true education is auto-education in which the teacher participates along with his pupils; or, to put it in another way, education is a free spiritual becoming through personal experience.

There is thus an apparent contradiction here, too, between administrative centralization and the new aim of education, which is concretely expressed in the absence of centralized courses of study. What the Ministry publishes is suggestive only for the guidance of teachers who are left free to adapt these suggestions to local conditions. Apart from the fundamentals a large place is left for spontaneity through the encouragement of singing and music, free drawing, spontaneous expression, the study of folksongs and folkways, respect for dialect, and recreational and intellectual occupations. The materials of instruction are to be derived from life and not from books, from the national classics rather than from school primers. Everything, therefore, that contributes to an insight into and appreciation of local and national life must be called upon, and this includes religion not in the interests of a Church but as an expression of national life and

in response to the child's aspiration for the divine. Hence every classroom is adorned with these symbols of national life—the crucifix and the portraits of the King and of the Dictator. Hence the teacher, while not required to be a Fascist, is expected at least to be neutral in political and religious matters.

The core of the curriculum is devoted to the cultivation of spontaneous expression in singing, games, drawing, and composition. Every child above the third grade is required to keep a diary, to write a longer composition each month, and an extended essay once a year, freely illustrated and dealing with events from his own experience.

The spirit of the school has been changed so far as regulations are concerned, but it is still far from realization owing to the poor preparation of the teachers, who are still wedded to old methods. Here and there experimental schools, conducted with the approval and under the supervision of the authorities, have collected groups of able teachers who, under the direction of skilled principals, are endeavoring to catch the spirit of the new school. An important part of the reorganization has been the reform of the system of preparing teachers. The points of departure in this reform are the following: (1) The teacher needs a broader cultural preparation than he has enjoyed hitherto and this must be crowned with a philosophical conception of life; (2) the greatest danger to the successful carrying out of the new spirit of the elementary school is an equipment of pedagogy and methods, because they tend to reduce education to mechanization and routine. Accordingly the emphasis in the seven-year preparation of the elementary school teacher is on culture and philosophy, with only slight attention to pedagogy and none to practice teaching. Beyond this teachers are selected for appointment on the basis of a competitive examination.

The large majority of Italian children at present enjoy only five or six years of elementary education. In the larger towns some may continue for three years more in the last

section of the school with a course having a vocational bias based on local needs. The secondary school system proceeds on the principle that the state has the right to select those who are to become the future leaders of the country and at the same time provide different avenues to such leadership. Selection and differentiation are thus the factors on which secondary education is based. The opportunities for secondary education, which is almost free, are open to those who can pass the entrance examinations and who by further examinations at stated intervals can prove their right to remain in the schools. Differentiation is provided in a variety of types of schools—the three-year school corresponding to the junior high school, the classical school and the scientific school with an eight-year course, the technical institute also of eight years' duration bifurcating into commercial and surveying courses, the seven-year normal school, and the seven-year school for girls. The curricula in the first four years of all except the first of these schools are almost identical, with a strong emphasis on Latin and other academic subjects and the complete neglect of sciences, followed in the second part of the course by somewhat more intensive specialization.

In the secondary schools, as in the elementary, a new spirit has been introduced, discrediting the purely quantitative conception of education and memory work, and a return has been made to the live sources of culture for the development of the personality of the student. Hence the emphasis on Latin and the classical tradition in Italian language and literature. Instead of the predominance assigned to linguistic study, the student is to become familiar with the masterpieces of literature, history, and civilization for the cultivation of a spiritual attitude in general and taste and appreciation in particular.

The work of the schools, whether public or private, is controlled by examinations conducted at the time of promotion from one course to another by the teachers of the class that the pupil is about to enter, by qualifying examinations

at the close of the professional schools, and by graduation examinations which admit to the universities. The two latter examinations are conducted by state-appointed commissions. Thus the system carefully safeguards, first of all the selection of students, second, the standards of retention, and third, admission to the universities, just as admission to the practice of the professions, based on university preparation, is granted only on passing an examination conducted by the state.

The reform has not left the universities untouched. They too have to minister to the needs and service of the state. The chief principle of reform has been to encourage those that are considered necessary and to discourage, by withholding financial support, those that are not, in order to check the overproduction of intellectuals who could not be absorbed in the work of the country. The universities have been granted autonomy within their statutes, but this autonomy becomes somewhat shorn of real meaning because the rector, the deans of faculties, directors of schools, and the professors are all appointed by the Minister of Public Instruction.

The whole system of education is thus nationalized on a hierarchical principle from the Minister of Public Instruction down to the classroom teacher. Only when the personnel is carefully selected and appointed, in all cases ultimately with the sanction of the Ministry—in other words, only when the state can count on a "safe" body of administrative officers and teachers—does decentralization begin. Then the aim of education, based on the traditions and spirit of the country, is to develop individuals who become culturally attuned to these traditions and this spirit. But freedom and initiative are checked ultimately by a series of examinations and the careful selection of textbooks which must be approved, at the expense of the author, by a state textbook commission.

Yet with all this one does not feel that there is a nationalistic or chauvinistic trend in the schools, whose aim is

national rather than nationalistic. The chauvinistic trend is to be found in the general atmosphere that pervades the party rule of the Fascists. Furthermore, the Fascists have created an institution outside the school whose deliberate aim is to train the younger generation in the principles of the party. This organization, the Balilla, is maintained by private contributions and state subsidy. It enrolls its members at the age of eight and keeps them until eighteen, when they graduate into the Fascist militia, and thence into the party. It is in this organization that boys (and girls) receive their political and military training from the time that they enter. Balilla conducts intellectual propaganda, and all those activities provided in other countries in the form of continuation schools, vocational education, and adult education. It organizes visits and excursions to the great museums and monuments of the country; it institutes competitions for prizes and scholarships; it conducts cruises in the Mediterranean to the colonies and other places; it promotes physical and athletic activities; and it maintains summer camps. The spirit of Balilla is best expressed in two quotations from addresses made by Mussolini to its members, "the dawn of life, the hope of the country, above all the army of tomorrow." "So conduct yourselves that the twentieth century shall see Rome, the heart of Latin civilization, sovereign of the Mediterranean, guiding light for all peoples." "We are Mediterraneans and our destiny without copying anybody has been and always will be the sea."

The motto of Balilla is "The Book and the Musket." It is through this organization, with its appeal to the youthful instinct for activity, ceremonial, and parades, that Fascism has forged an instrument that will train up a generation at the beck and call of the party. Compared with this instrument and the other instruments for the disciplining and regimentation of the adults the school, in spite of the new spirit of the reforms, is likely for long to be but an anemic and ineffective institution.

EDUCATION OF THE ADOLESCENT IN ENGLAND*

THE American experiment of secondary education for all has always been regarded with interest and scepticism by the foreign educator. While he is ready to admit that educational opportunity is an essential characteristic of a democracy and while he would agree with the underlying principle, the results leave him in doubt even apart from any considerations of differences of social milieu and cultural background in this country. It is interesting for this reason to see how some of the foreign countries are being driven by the logic of circumstances not only to an acceptance of the principle that a democracy must provide the fullest educational opportunities but that the realization of this principle is actually becoming a matter of practical politics.

The most important educational problem in England, the question on which there is today the most widespread discussion, centers round this principle. Since 1902 England has been slowly and gradually building up a national system of education, but in this system there are still too many gaps, too much overlapping, and often, as a result, too much loss of energy and effort. Undoubtedly the War contributed largely to an awakening of the English conscience and aroused a recognition of her educational deficiencies. There was a widespread realization of the tremendous waste and loss of talent and ability due to a lack of educational

* Lecture in a course on Contemporary Educational Movements Abroad, Teachers College, 1928–29.

opportunities. Since then the growing industrial and commercial depression has undoubtedly had the effect of inculcating the idea that national recuperation and progress demand a closer affiliation between education and the life of the country.

When secondary education began to be established and organized at public expense after the passage of the Education Act of 1902, it was built up on the tradition of the only type of secondary school then available, the private and endowed school whose work was governed by the aims of general culture or liberal education and the entrance requirements of the universities. There was thus inherited a traditional prejudice against direct preparation for entrance into industry and commerce, although the majority of the pupils in the new secondary schools were destined for these careers. From the discussions on educational reform during the War there emerged two principles that were embodied in the Education Act of 1918; first that the educational tutelage of the State should extend over boys and girls up to the age of eighteen through the provision of compulsory attendance in continuation schools, and second that no pupil capable of profiting thereby should be denied an opportunity for full-time secondary education. For various reasons the continuation school requirement failed. For the continuation school and the limitation of secondary education to those capable of profiting thereby, the Labor Party substituted a demand for Secondary Schools for All. Unfortunately it has never been quite clear what was meant by this demand; whether in general the implication was not that the privilege of academic education of which so many were deprived should be extended to all.

In the meantime the whole problem has been precipitated by a large number of new circumstances. A general feeling has gradually been developing that the pupils in the last stages of elementary education are marking time and leaving school at the age of fourteen without any kind of orientation

for life. Under the existing system of limited opportunities the best pupils are selected by an examination at the age of eleven plus, with the result that elementary school principals and teachers complain of the practice of skimming off the top. The proposal to introduce compulsory attendance at continuation schools has been definitely dropped. The local authorities which have for some time been making efforts to meet the need by the establishment at their own expense of a type of school corresponding virtually to the junior high school are becoming restive because of the failure of the central authority to contribute its share of the increased cost. In the field of secondary education proper some doubt has been developing in the last few years whether the scope of its curricula is wide enough and whether the large number of failures in examinations do not point to a certain amount of maladjustment. This means the development of a recognition of differences in individual abilities and needs. Of far greater immediate influence have been the economic depression and the widespread unemployment of juveniles, with the very obvious dangers of moral deterioration. England thus finds herself confronted with the problem of coördinating her educational efforts and resources and of establishing an educational system that will provide more adequate opportunities adapted to the needs of the individual and of society.

Before proceeding to a discussion of the proposals for reform a brief description of the present system is necessary. Leaving out of account the facilities for private education which constitute an important part of the national system, the majority of pupils attend the elementary school from the age of five to fourteen. At the age of eleven plus most local authorities have established an examination of all pupils who have reached a standard equivalent to the American sixth grade. On the basis of this examination the ablest pupils are offered opportunities to enter a secondary school and the next best to enter a central or junior high school. In addi-

tion there are junior technical, commercial, and art schools, trade schools, and domestic science schools for girls. The probability is that of the total number of pupils between the ages of eleven and sixteen not more than twelve per cent are enjoying an education other than elementary.

The central schools are institutions established some twenty years ago by the local authorities to meet the needs of abler pupils who could not go on to a secondary school but who needed more than an elementary education. These schools provide an education for pupils between the ages of eleven and fifteen consisting of two years of general education and followed by two years of prevocational courses with a bias toward industry, commerce, or domestic science for girls. So far as the central authority is concerned the schools, although more costly, are financed as elementary schools. More recently the ambition of the principals of some of these schools has diverted them from fulfilling the objectives for which they were established and influenced them to turn these institutions into pale imitations of secondary schools.

The opportunities for secondary education have increased enormously in the last fifteen years. One condition on which the central authority appropriates its grants for these schools is that they shall admit each year pupils from the elementary schools free of tuition up to 25 per cent of their enrollment. At present the average number of free places is nearly 40 per cent for the country as a whole, while some of the more progressive authorities have abolished tuition in their secondary schools for all pupils. But unlike the American high school the English secondary school is selective, although complaints are heard that fee-paying pupils are often admitted on an examination of lower standard than are the free placers. Besides free tuition all authorities grant scholarships which carry a monetary benefit for the ablest pupils, and are authorized to grant maintenance allowances in deserving cases. On the whole, the poor but able pupil has

a far better opportunity not only for secondary but for higher education than in the United States.

The curriculum of the secondary school is almost wholly academic and general in character. Its content includes one or two foreign languages, history and geography, mathematics and science, music, drawing, and physical education. Domestic science may be provided for girls. The duration of the courses in the public secondary schools is six years, divided into two sections, one of four years and one of two. In the first section practically the only option available is in the choice of ancient or modern languages; in the second many schools offer opportunities for specialization in the academic fields. At the end of the fourth year every school submits its pupils to an external examination conducted by a number of examining bodies, associated with the universities and recognized by the Board of Education. Pupils passing with high grades may become eligible for admission to the universities without further examination. In other words, the standard of attainment expected in these school certificate examinations, as they are called, is almost equivalent to graduation from high school. A second or advanced examination is conducted by the external boards at the close of the secondary course. The probability is that the student holding an advanced certificate would be admitted to the junior college year in this country.

So far as American practice is concerned the English system would indicate that for many of our pupils in high schools the pace is too slow and that the movement for bringing down the work of the junior college into the high school is quite feasible and that without overworking our pupils. These facts can be corroborated from the practices of many other countries.

There are signs that criticism of secondary education is developing. For the pupils whose interests and abilities lie along academic lines the system is excellent and the product is one of which any country might be proud. But the system

has remained somewhat static and neglected the facts of its own development. The number of pupils in the secondary schools has more than doubled since 1914, and according to one report on the subject: "It is scarcely reasonable to suppose that a curriculum which has for its chief aim the passing of such a test is the most appropriate for them, and the results do not appear to justify that conclusion." In one locality only 45 per cent of those who should have taken the first examination did so and only 29 per cent of the total eligible, or 64 per cent of those taking the examination, passed. Further, in this area only about 20 per cent continued their education beyond the secondary school and 80 per cent went into commercial or industrial life, or remained at home.

From other quarters criticisms are being leveled against the examinations. While examinations do not determine the work actually done in the secondary schools, they do tend to limit the scope of the curricula and to reduce the amount and variety of differentiation that may be offered. There is thus a demand that the secondary schools be offered an opportunity of organizing their curricula in such a way as to make them better adapted to the needs of the varied interests and abilities of the clientele. One authority, the West Riding of Yorkshire, illustrating the possibility that the English system offers for experimentation and elasticity, has already begun to introduce what are called alternative courses side by side with the general or academic courses. These include courses in handicrafts, engineering, textiles, agriculture, commerce and secretarial work, domestic subjects, and art.

It is in these circumstances that there was published at the close of 1926 the *Report of the Consultative Committee on the Education of the Adolescent.* As is usual in these reports, the ablest opinions in the country were collected, and facts on the best practices in the field under consideration not only in England but abroad were brought together. The Report recommends a complete reorganization of the system

of education, a recommendation since endorsed by the Board of Education in its Educational Pamphlet on the *New Prospect in Education*. Essentially the proposal is to transfer all pupils at the age of eleven from the primary school to some form of secondary education and to extend the limit of compulsory attendance for all to the age of fifteen. Several points must be emphasized here. The proposal involves a change in nomenclature. Hitherto neither the term elementary nor the term secondary has been accurate; some elementary education, as for instance in the central schools, is actually secondary in character, while many secondary schools have elementary classes. Further, it is intended by a change of terminology that all types of education after the primary shall be called secondary. The proposal to transfer pupils on the basis of age instead of scholastic appointments is made deliberately on the principle that a new school, new ground, new environment better adapted to the interests and abilities of each range and variety of pupil will act as a stimulus and an incentive. The extension of the age limit of compulsory attendance to fifteen will not only keep pupils in school longer but will make it possible to organize courses of four years, a reasonable duration, better adapted to the needs and capacities of the individual pupils.

All pupils would, under this plan, have opportunities for education beyond the primary, but it is not intended that all shall have the same education nor that all shall attend the same school. The old type of six-year secondary school will be retained, as will also the intermediate type of four years. The system will thus have selective and non-selective types of schools, each adapted to the needs of a particular group. The democratic element will be conserved by leaving the doors open for transfers as soon as discoveries of maladjustment are made.

Up to this point the demands for democratic opportunities in education and the need of differentiation have been cited as the basis of the proposed reform. England is proceeding

on the basis of equality but not of identity of opportunities, a principle which can be justified on the basis of individual differences. There is, however, another important factor that is playing a rôle in the reform, that is, the claims of an industrialized society. The new schools are to perform two functions, to give a better preparation for life in this industrialized society and to correct the evils of industrialization. Obviously industrialism has wrought changes in the social life of most nations. It demands, according to the Report, narrow specialization; it produces a patterned uniformity of work and behavior, which is nowhere better illustrated than in this country; and it infects, if not corrected, the minds of men with the genius of its own life. The purpose of education is to correct these defects by giving to the mind the breadth and the fresh vitality of new interests, and at the same time to make industry more effective.

The real contribution of the Report lies in its recognition of differences of abilities and interests, and the consequent conclusion that modern society needs a new conception of the meaning of liberal education. Hitherto this has been synonymous with academic or general subjects. No statement in the Report brings the new English point of view nearer to the American than the following:

> A humane or liberal education is not one given through books alone, but one which brings children into contact with the larger interests of mankind; and the aim of schools . . . should be to provide such an education by means of a curriculum containing large opportunities for practical work and related to living interests.

Hence the curricula should be based on the needs and the interests of the individual and the claims of society, and should equip the individual as a workman and as a citizen. A well-balanced system must combine both ideals in the single conception of a social individuality, providing the fullest scope to individuality and insuring care for the claims

and needs of society. The curricula, in other words, must not be divorced from real life. The bond between the different types of schools that will constitute the system of secondary education will be furnished by community of aims:

(1) To strengthen character, individual and national,
   (*a*) by courses that are in close relation to life and
   (*b*) by extra-curricular activities or the corporate life of the school.
(2) To teach pupils to take pleasure in music and art, in manual activities, in literature and history, as a preparation for leisure; in other words, to cultivate tastes and to arouse interests.
(3) To awaken and guide the practical and general intelligence for the better and more skilled service of the community in all its multiple business and complex affairs.

An analysis of these aims would reveal that they include all of the seven cardinal principles of secondary education. The question will probably be raised why, since England seems to be moved by the same facts that have led to the adoption of the cosmopolitan high school in this country, has she not been driven to adopt the same organization? One answer has already been suggested and that is that the English conception of equality of opportunity does not imply identity of school types. Another reason is inherent in the general principles on which English education is founded, a national suspicion of uniformity and standardization in social institutions. Again, there is a theoretical objection to large schools and consequently to mass production in education. Finally, the fear of catering to mediocrity or of lowering of standards that may result from an attempt on the part of the school to be all things to all men has played no small part in the decision. After all, education, the more advanced it becomes, does inevitably become more selective. Every educational system, no matter how democratic it seeks to be, can only be represented graphically by a pyramid. The base is everywhere becoming broader; the tendency today is to avoid

making the sides converge too sharply. The interests of pupils who develop late or are maladjusted can be conserved by suitable arrangements for transfers. The English theory is, then, that the small school, conscious of the particular function that it has to perform for the individual and for society, is likely to become a far better instrument for the attainment of its ends than the school that aims at a larger number of targets with the risk of missing such aims too frequently. The functional organization of schools furnishes the possibility of a better adaptation of teacher qualifications to the specific work of a school. The essential principle that must not be missed is that with the provision of educational opportunities on which England is now embarking the interests of all individuals are being safeguarded, but beyond that adequate provision is being made for the selection and training of those who are to become the intellectual leaders of the country. In the American preoccupation for educational opportunities, it is the interests of this group that have been neglected until very recently. It may be that England, in keeping the academic type of secondary school intact and free from the entanglements of other courses, is deliberately conscious of the importance in an educational system of insuring the high standard and quality of that education which is to produce intellectual leaders, a standard and quality that may serve as models to other types of schools whose function may equally be the selection of future leaders in other activities of modern society.[1]

[1] Since this was written three Bills have been presented to the House of Commons to extend the period of compulsory education to the age of fifteen and to provide maintenance allowances to necessitous pupils during the last year of their stay in school and to adjust the relations between denominational and public schools. Although these Bills were withdrawn, the reorganization will undoubtedly come and local education authorities are proceeding with plans for the reorganization of their systems into primary education to the age of eleven plus, to be followed by a variety of types of post-primary or secondary education,—selective and non-selective in character.

THE CHALLENGE IN SECONDARY EDUCATION*

AMERICAN secondary education is again passing through a period of serious criticism to which it has always been exposed from time to time. No sooner is a period of apparently stable equilibrium reached than the position begins to be attacked and a new era of unrest sets in. The general principle upon which the American system of public secondary education rests is endorsed on the whole with little question. It is now generally accepted that the opportunity for free education in accordance with individual ability and inclination is an essential feature of a democratic system of education. Today the criticisms of secondary education center more and more round the quality of that branch of our educational system. It is claimed not only that the graduate of an American high school fails to reach the standard for graduation from a European secondary school by about two years but that the education that he has attained is built upon an uncertain foundation, and lacks solidity and comprehensiveness. It is further maintained that the secondary school fails to provide that educational and cultural stimulus which produces the intellectual leaders of a society.

These criticisms are finally clinched by comparisons with the status of secondary schools abroad and by the implication that foreign countries are not in any way confronted with any serious problems in the education of their adolescent groups. And yet, as will be shown later, the most serious problem

* This article appeared in *Independent Education*, June, 1929, pp. 20 ff.

with which most countries all over the world are grappling at the present time is that of the education of the adolescent—not merely of that small selected group that has hitherto enjoyed secondary education in the traditional sense, but of all adolescents from about the age of twelve on. The fact is that the whole fabric of traditional secondary education for that selected group out of which the selection of intellectual leaders was made is being threatened everywhere, and the problem today is the problem of devising an educational system that will involve no loss of the traditional quality of intellectual training and at the same time will provide educational opportunity and differentiation according to needs and abilities. Everywhere a new era is opening in education; at present it has hardly passed beyond the stage of theoretical discussion; the full solution awaits economic recovery. A comparison of the current tendencies will bring out the strength and weakness of the American system.

One can find a certain gradation in purposes varying from the purely traditional through different stages to the democratic optimism that characterizes our system. The traditional type is that found in most of the Latin-American countries with the notable exception of Mexico, which has recently inaugurated a system not unlike that of the United States. In these countries secondary education is looked upon very definitely as an instrument for the selection of those who shall proceed to the universities and thence to the higher professions, liberal careers, and government service. Although the secondary schools are closely articulated with the elementary schools, the proportion of secondary pupils to elementary is not more than two per cent. For purposes of selection certain traditional subjects of instruction—languages, mathematics, history, geography, and sciences—constitute a fixed and uniform curriculum as the basis of examinations. Subject matter is logically organized without respect for the needs of the individual, for varied abilities and capacities, and for the requirements of modern society. The

emphasis is on instruction and mental training. To the Latin-American the cultured man is he who can speak or read one, perhaps two, modern foreign languages; to this aim other subjects are subordinated and the emphasis is always not on their enriching experience, but rather on the accumulation of knowledge, facts, and information.

Now knowledge is undoubtedly of the greatest importance but only if it has meaning and can be applied or used whether in practical situations or for personal appreciation and satisfaction. Unfortunately in the countries under discussion its presentation is governed by two aims—preparation for examinations and ability to reproduce on call, and the requirements of university entrance for those who survive so far. The methods of instruction are governed by the same aims; the teacher lectures, the pupil listens, and gives out the information at suitable intervals. Such an approach tends to make the conception of culture or liberal education artificial and lifeless, with an emphasis on the subjects themselves rather than on the dynamic qualities that culture should imply, that is, something that contributes to the growth of the individual and grows with him. The interests of the individual tend to be submerged in the interests of the subjects, and his progress is measured not in terms of what he can do but rather in terms of ability to retain and reproduce what he has acquired either from lectures or from the texts.

Everything is thus subordinated to the exigencies of the examinations, which serve as a rigorous sieve for selection, so rigorous that only about ten per cent of the pupils ultimately succeed. The teachers are, in general, masters of their subjects but, with exceptions, know little of methods or of the pupils. There is no free association between teacher and pupil, and very rarely any corporate life or extra-curricular activities. This absence of relationship with the everyday world tends to develop in the minds both of the pupils and of the public a contempt for manual activities and an inclination to look upon secondary education as a method of release from

industrial and commercial activities on which the future of these countries depends. Industrial and technical education exists but enjoys a far lower esteem than secondary as thus understood.

Now these systems are not accepted without criticism. Their ineffectiveness for modern needs is recognized by educational leaders in each country concerned. Thus one critic says:

> An institution for secondary education which succeeds in educating only the minority of the student body attending it is in itself an indication of serious defects which endanger the specific function for which it is intended.

A minister of education in the Argentine attempted in 1916 to change the whole system and replace it by a universal system of post-elementary education, starting with an exploratory course of three years, to be followed by a great variety of other courses. The absence of a modern content, including social sciences and fine arts, with proper attention to health and exercise, is deplored by another. Still another form of criticism sees the economic backwardness of one of the South American countries as the result of the failure of the secondary school to adapt itself to modern needs and conditions. Finally, Mexico, which until recently had the same type of secondary education, is, through the efforts of its federal government, introducing new types of secondary schools based on principles whose kinship to our own would be readily recognized.

The second stage in the approach to secondary education is illustrated by the French system, which, though it is selective, has a more conscious and deliberate cultural aim. This system aims to cultivate an intellectual élite through a rigorous training in the humanities, using the term in its broadest sense as a study of the best that man has said and done in the past and is doing in the present. Employing what we know in this country as an academic curriculum consisting of languages, sciences, mathematics, history and

geography, French schools aim to cultivate not merely that knowledge which should come from the sincere pursuit of these subjects over a period of seven years, but ability to speak well and ability to write well as the outward signs of ability to think logically and clearly. Knowledge *qua* knowledge is not put on a pedestal and the examinations do not place a premium on ability to reproduce information and facts. There are thus definite and clearly defined objectives, the selection of an intellectual élite and the development of a national culture. But in spite of the excellence of the teachers and the development of excellent methods in the teaching of some subjects, there is considerable unrest. The causes of dissatisfaction are twofold: the principle of selection of an élite, that is, the provision of the best possible education for the few, is accepted, but it is claimed that the basis of selection is too narrow; too many pupils are in school because their parents can afford to keep them there whether they have the necessary ability or not, while poor pupils of ability do not enjoy adequate opportunities for advanced education. The second criticism is that the system leads to a considerable amount of cramming for examinations, and there is reasonable doubt about the attainments of those who just manage to pass and of the large percentage that fails. It is beginning to be recognized that France needs an élite not merely in the intellectual field but in all other activities of life. The whole problem is being faced from a new point of view: what is the proper kind of secondary education and what should be its relation to a democratic society? The problem has been succinctly stated by a leading French authority:

> It is important that all the children of France should be considered alike as living plants, whose spontaneous growth will be assured by the same methods; only the trunk will be allowed to grow up to a certain height before the branches are permitted to shoot out but without opposing any artificial obstacles to the expansion of those whose innate powers promise to raise them up to the level for which they are destined.

France is beginning to recognize, in general, first, that an educational system must provide for variety of educational opportunities; second, that such variety of opportunities is important for national progress; and third, that running through a differentiated system of education there must be a strain of common culture, of national ideals. This change has been brought about by the realization that a large number of pupils fail to meet the high standards of achievement that are set up, and that democracy in education means not merely identity of opportunity but variety and differentiation. Society as organized today not only needs to cultivate what the French call disinterested studies, but must also meet the claims of utility. Something along the lines of the new ideas is already being put into effect; side by side with the traditional academic studies are being placed a mixed course that is academic and practical and a course that is technical in character. Thus to some extent France is moving in the direction of a cosmopolitan secondary school; but it must be emphasized that while she is opening the doors more widely to those who seek an education beyond the elementary, she is safeguarding the interests of the best minds. Any educational system beyond the elementary is bound to be selective, but a democratic system demands that that selection be scientific. For this reason there are many in France today who would welcome the development and use of diagnostic tests on a national scale.

It would be an error to assume that there is unanimity in this movement for increasing educational opportunities and variety. Those classes that have hitherto enjoyed the privileges of secondary education for themselves or their children are opposed to any movement to throw the doors of the *lycée* open more widely to new special groups that would increase the competition for the limited number of positions reserved for the educated classes. There are others who fear that an increased number in the present type of secondary schools will inevitably lower intellectual standards and conse-

quently the high level of academic work. Still others feel that the whole palladium of French culture which for three hundred years has been a model and inspiration to the world will be shaken. There are few, however, who recognize explicitly that the subtle social and economic changes, especially the latter—for France is slowly changing from an agricultural to an industrial régime—are at the root of the demands for educational change and that the demand for educational opportunity as an obvious right in a democracy is but one of many of the causes of the present unrest.

Germany is confronted with problems that are almost similar. There is a pressing demand for a complete reorganization of the educational system on the basis of the common school up to age twelve and differentiation with opportunities thereafter. For the present Germany has had to compromise between the demands for radical reforms and the claims of tradition. This compromise consists, first, in having a common foundation for all until the age of ten and differentiating thereafter. In order to increase the opportunities for secondary education beyond those that existed before the War, more scholarships are being offered and greater differentiation has been introduced in the schools and in the courses offered. The doors are not yet wide open but a change is gradually taking place. A change of another character is also proceeding. Before the War the ideal of the secondary school was the development of careful, persevering scholarship, which too often consisted mainly of painful amassing of facts and information with an absence of critical judgment. Education was selective, but its ends were not sufficiently national in scope, except from the purely political point of view. The external reform thus consists of an attempt to increase educational opportunities; the internal reform lies in a change of spirit. The aim is no longer the production of narrow specialists along the lines of certain subjects, but the emphasis of the various approaches to civilization in their significance for German national cul-

ture. The secondary schools aim to emphasize the various forces that have made German culture today and to point out its present significance.

The approach is thus historical; yet it does not stop at this point but aims to develop an appreciation of Germany's present problems. Starting in the lower classes and continuing the work of the elementary schools, an effort is being made to cultivate an awareness of social organization and an understanding of its significance. The integrating value of education is being recognized, and the integration is being made round national ways of living and thinking rather than round so many subjects. The subjects and their content are selected for their contribution to a common end. This means that the courses are no longer rigorously prescribed, and that the faculties of each school are given the opportunity on the basis of *Suggestions* from the Ministries to adapt the courses of study to local conditions. The reform in the approach to the curriculum has been inevitably accompanied by a reform in the methods of instruction; instead of absorbing information the pupil is encouraged through activity methods to discover it for himself, to make the acquisition of knowledge his own. Thus there is greater flexibility in the school régime. This new emphasis on educational purposes of the secondary school rather than on subjects is accompanied by another important change which is to contribute to the better all-round training of the German boys and girls. This is the encouragement given to the development of social and corporate life in the schools and the new devotion to sports of all kinds.

The German reform is not yet complete; its secondary education, while becoming more widely available and more elastic, is still an education for the minority. There are, of course, other types of post-elementary schools but they are not incorporated in the secondary system, even though in some cases the differences are slight. Thus, although in part for economic reasons, in part owing to the opposition of the

traditional forces, an installment of the demand for equality and variety of opportunities has been achieved, but only an installment. There are many who fear a lowering of intellectual and academic standards because the secondary school is still academic in character and is still governed by entrance to the university as the goal. The absence of adequate provisions for differentiation is producing a large number of misfits, who would undoubtedly profit from more practical curricula. Certainly some of the universities are becoming alarmed by the lowering of standards that they profess to see, but they do not see with equal insight that the coincidence of democratic demands and of industrialization inevitably means an educational revolution and that the standards of university work are not the sole determinants of educational aims and purposes. The problems of education in a democracy are clearly recognized in a recent memorandum of the University of Berlin, although the implications seem to have been missed:

> The significance of the change in the secondary school leaving examination is the result of the general raising of the educational demands for cultural life and the tremendous expansion of the educated classes in society.

In Germany, as in France, the further developments and interpretations of the social and economic changes depend on an improvement in the economic situation. But in Germany, just as in France, there is a strong determination not to sacrifice the standards of quality so long associated with the education of the intellectual élite; these standards will, indeed, determine the standards of other types of education that will be established to meet the needs and abilities of all adolescents.

The present educational situation in England is not unlike that through which this country passed about twenty years ago. There is there a sincere desire to democratize the educational system, to place it on a common foundation, to keep

more pupils in school beyond the elementary school period, to provide more opportunities for post-elementary education. There has not been in England a well-defined system of secondary education as in France and Germany, partly because England is not given to systematization, partly because England attempts to give free play to variety of organization. Hence there are the old "public" schools, which are not public in our sense; there are private schools of various kinds and quality; and there are the new public secondary schools maintained at public expense. Nor is there any clearly defined aim of secondary education. Generally it is understood that a secondary curriculum consists of two foreign languages, English, science and mathematics, history and geography, music, manual work, drawing, and physical exercises. But there are no prescribed curricula or courses of study and each school enjoys a high degree of autonomy, tempered by responsibility. The standards that exist are those set up by a number of examining boards, which examine pupils at two stages in their educational careers, once at the end of their fourth year, and again two years later. But England neither emphasizes intellectual attainments like Germany, nor the obtaining of diplomas and certificates like France. Her aim is to train men and women.

Her great contribution to educational practice does not lie in methods or courses of study but in the processes of character-formation, in the moral and social training of the individual. Here again England does not possess any formula or definition or theory of character or character-formation. From the point of view of organization the provision for character-formation is unobtrusive. The greatest effectiveness is attained outside the classroom; it is recognized that the best method for the formation of character lies in the development of a community spirit, a feeling of corporate life, an *esprit de corps*. The school stands for something more than instruction; it has customs, standards, and traditions that must be lived up to. The control is not in the

hands of the teachers nor in the rigor of discipline, but in a personal sense of the fitness of things, of *noblesse oblige*. The system aims to cultivate, through social and athletic activities, a feeling for honesty, uprightness, unselfishness, coöperation, give and take, fair play, and playing the game. This system provides for the emergence of leaders, and furnishes opportunities for the exercise of initiative. It is unnecessary to give the various types of school organization that develop to carry out this aim. The bond that binds the English nation together lies in the conception of character. Intellectual training thus assumes a secondary place, but it is there for those who want it. As in France and Germany, but not on as extensive a scale, provisions are also found in England for the cultivation of the best abilities; this is true not only in the great "public" schools but in the newer council secondary schools, whose competition for university scholarships, long the perquisite of the older schools, is beginning to be felt.

But England is also passing through a period of unrest. First there are those, men and women, who feel that the curricula now provided in the secondary schools are not sufficiently broad, that they do not pay adequate attention to the different abilities and needs of the pupils, a fact brought out by the eliminations and the failures in examinations. Experiments in broadening the offerings by the provision of alternative courses of a practical nature are already being made. But there is a demand of another kind, and that is for secondary education for all with the inevitable consequence of still greater differentiation of courses. It has already been proposed in two of the most important publications recently issued in England, the Hadow *Report on the Education of the Adolescent* and the Board of Education's *The New Prospect in Education*, that the period of compulsory education be extended to fifteen and that side by side with the traditional academic courses new courses of a more practical character be introduced. Some authorities have already adopted these

suggestions without waiting for a lead from the central board. This means that the whole conception both of secondary education and of liberal education is being broadened, and if the new types of schools are incorporated in the secondary system pupils will find their own proper levels as they do now with the differentiated courses in the same high school in this country. The claims of democratic opportunities will be safeguarded by leaving all doors open that lead to advanced education for the abler pupils.

There is thus a tendency that is fairly general to demand an adaptation to modern needs of the type of secondary education that has become traditional, an insistence everywhere on differentiation, and a general recognition that the opportunities for secondary education must be increased for all adolescents; emphasis is being placed on one or other or even all of these points. The importance of an élite is not ignored, but it is recognized that provision must be made for an adequate education for all in other than intellectual activities. In a recent address Lord Londonderry, voicing an opinion frequently expressed in the last two years by the Minister of Education, made the following statement:

> Today I desire to emphasize the supreme value of coöperation, not only between our technical schools and our industries, but also between the whole of our educational system, in all its phases, and the industrial and commercial life of the nation.

As compared with the countries described where does the United States stand?

It will already have become clear that all the tendencies thus far discussed are found in the United States. Owing to the absence of age-old cultural traditions, such as are found in Europe, the whole subject has been approached in this country with more imagination, with a better analysis of its implications, and with attention to all the factors involved in the relation of the education of the adolescent not only to other educational institutions but also to the needs of

society and the individual. This has only in part been made possible by the greater wealth enjoyed by the country; more important has been the readiness to depart from tradition and to build afresh. The principles on which the American system is based are that education must be universal, that opportunity shall be provided for the individual compatible with his ability, that the organization shall stimulate and encourage the process, and that provision shall be made for the development of character and intelligence. To these may be added the principle that education cannot be static and must change with the changes in society. The secondary school, as the school for all, has taken into account individual differences. So far as aims are concerned, the first is the development of intelligent citizenship, which implies not only ability and intelligence to perform one's duties as a member of society but also ability to be economically self-sufficient. At the same time, the school must also develop ability to utilize one's leisure time. The single American institution known as the high school is undertaking to perform the task which in other countries is distributed in a number of different institutions, up to the present arranged in a hierarchy of values and esteem.

In the light of the tendencies abroad surely no exception can be taken to these principles, which are increasingly being confirmed and justified by the comparative approach. What, then, are the criticisms? First, it is charged that foreign secondary schools are more efficient and that the standards of achievement are higher. Second, that the pupils work harder and are more persevering. Third, that our curricular organization in terms of units is a rope of sand and fails to provide for an integrated education. And fourth, that the European teachers are superior in scholarship and ability to the American.

To take up these criticisms in turn it may as well be admitted that the standards of achievement set for the secondary pupils abroad are higher than in this country and that

the graduate of a European secondary school is, by the regulations of a number of committees on equivalents, recognized to be about ready to enter the junior year of college in this country. But it must be remembered that the pupils abroad are selected from the start and that those who attain the high standards constitute but a small percentage of those who enter. What do those who fail or drop out receive from their education? If the pupils abroad, chiefly in Germany and France, do work harder, it is generally not through interest but rather for the status that is conferred on the secondary school graduate and the privileges that go with it.

Much more serious and well founded is the charge that our unit system does not make for an integrated education; that under it too many subjects are introduced about whose educational value there is some doubt; that accumulation of credits rather than solid achievement is encouraged. There is considerable justification in this charge and, even with the provision for a certain number of constants, there is the danger that the American pupil may acquire a smattering of a large range of subjects rather than a consistent knowledge of a few, and that solid interests, which are the true bases of a liberal education, are not cultivated. There is a failure to integrate the work round the native tongue as in France, or round national culture, as today in Germany. Too many loopholes are available, even under the careful guidance of teachers and principals, for chopping and changing the programs. The system of units and credits arose in the heyday of the elective principle on the theory that any subject taught for the same length of time under competent teachers is as good as any other subject. Not only have we moved some distance from such an exaggerated conception of the elective system, but it is too often forgotten that the theory dealt largely with the value of various subjects as mental disciplines and, in my opinion, was not intended as a blanket statement of cultural values. The result of the misinterpretation has been the general acceptance of the notion that "pushpin is as good as

poetry," not merely for mental discipline, but for cultural development as well, with a consequent confusion of aims and purposes and to the detriment of clear thinking. The experimental stage in this matter has passed and it is at this point at which consideration of reform might begin.

This raises a question of larger scope, and that is nothing less than the meaning of culture or a liberal education. Those critics, native and foreign, who deplore the absence of culture in this country are in danger of defining culture in terms of certain types of knowledge or information instead of a process that is personal and spiritual, of a something that goes on in the individual as he interprets experience, not only the past but contemporary as well. The approach to this problem in secondary and higher education abroad is almost wholly traditional and historical; in the United States the approach has been reversed and begins with the immediate and contemporary—*primum vivere, deinde philosophari*—a sound principle if it were carried out by teachers who see life steadily and see it whole. The onlooker may perhaps diagnose the situation better than those of us who are immersed in it. Thus J. A. Spender in *The America of Today* summarizes the situation in higher education (and the statement applies with equal force to secondary education):

> The English academic, who has been brought up on Newman's *Idea of a University*, feels a certain dreariness of spirit, as Matthew Arnold used to say, when he sees the great University of Harvard launching out into immense and imposing Business faculty. And he laughs sarcastically when he learns that certain American universities of the modern type give degrees or diplomas in horticulture, domestic science, salesmanship, drug-store management, etc. The Englishman, nevertheless, is wrong. This is the natural way in which a new and developing country breaks into education. In such a country the higher education will remain in the air—the privilege of a few favorites of fortune—if it is jealously guarded as the region of a few select studies. A new American university regards it as

> its first task to go out into the highways and hedges and compel them to come in. In this initial stage its feast must be spread to tempt the appetite; and it follows the universal habit in this business country of discovering what the public wants and giving it without stint or shame. Very unlike Oxford or Cambridge, no doubt, but it is absurd to compare this breaking of ground in a new country with the traditional type of those ancient institutions. Even they are finding that they have to compromise with new ways, and the new country inevitably starts with them.

Putting the same idea more succinctly A. E. Zimmern states in *Learning and Leadership:*

> It is a common observation that American schools and colleges are strong in the natural sciences and weak in the arts. Shallow critics have concluded that American boys and girls are inferior in "culture," whatever that may mean, to their European brothers and sisters. The true explanation is, of course, quite different. It is that American culture, springing, as all true culture must, out of the conditions of American life, is naturally rather a reflection on men's relation to external nature than to history, literature, or philosophy.

The last criticism, that our teachers are inferior in preparation to their foreign colleagues, is, if we take the country as a whole, more serious, because it cannot be contradicted. For it must be admitted that the amount of thought and deliberation that has been devoted in the last quarter century to curriculum organization, the construction of courses of study, the devising of methods of instruction, and the securing of financial support that has filled the country with high school buildings, even in the smallest towns, of a magnificence that can rarely be matched even in European or other capitals, has not been paralleled by equal concentration on securing a teaching personnel adequate in preparation and stability to the educational situation. We have not in this country yet given thought to the educational equivalent of Machiavelli's statement that "not money but good soldiers

win battles." There are today teachers who are inadequately prepared to teach the subjects that they profess; there are others (and through no fault of their own but because of the system) who are compelled by circumstances to teach subjects in which they have had no preparation; still others are burdened with a multiplicity of unrelated subjects, which means too often inadequate mastery of some or all as well as dissipation of energy; and, finally, teaching is neither a stable nor a lifelong profession. Furthermore, there are no well-defined standards of attainment to serve as guides, a fact to which any college freshman class furnishes superabundant testimony, although preparation for college entrance can by no means be regarded as the sole aim of secondary education, here or elsewhere.

It is here that the real problem of American secondary education lies, and it has not, as yet, been seriously attacked. Granting the selective and limited character of secondary education abroad, there are not on the whole many teachers in this country with the qualifications of an English teacher with a good "honours" degree, or of a French teacher with the *agrégation* or even the *licence*, or of a German teacher who often enters on his career at an age when many American teachers have already left the profession. Standards of qualifications are undoubtedly rising here and there, but unless concerted efforts are made to solve this problem, the really fundamental problem of education, we will be driven to one or other of the following conclusions—that a program of mass secondary education toward which this, as other countries, is tending is impracticable because enough capable teachers cannot be secured to carry it on; or that the provision of equality of opportunities with a wide variety of courses to meet the needs of differentiated abilities is impossible, and that a return must be made to the good old fortifying courses of tradition.

The first of these conclusions involves the question of the ability and will of a country to bear the cost of better

teachers; the second, if the signs to which tendencies all over the world point are rightly interpreted, would be not only impossible but unsound in the light of modern educational psychology and current demands in the field of national economics.

The European countries have demonstrated that within the limited field of the traditional secondary school quality of standards can be maintained; today, in their efforts to increase the quantity of education, to expand the conception of secondary so as to reach a far wider percentage of the adolescent population, these countries are anxious not merely to preserve the old standards of quality but to extend them to the newly developing types of schools. The United States has demonstrated, as no other country has yet done, that it is possible to bring the opportunities of a secondary education, highly diversified and differentiated, within the reach of all, but this demonstration has been made at a sacrifice of quality. The administrative problem of providing these opportunities has been so absorbing that there has undoubtedly been a tendency to neglect the one factor that would bring success, and that is the teachers.

There is urgent need today of a fuller and richer consciousness of the implications of the great educational adventure on which this country is now engaged and which is attracting the interest of foreign educators in increasing numbers. This adventure is nothing less than the creation of a new conception of culture, of liberal education. If a system of secondary education is to be adapted to the intellectual levels of the adolescents and if it is to be based on the activities, institutions, thoughts, and activities of modern life, the only guarantee of success lies not in compiling long lists of detailed objectives with specific pieces of information and facts to meet them, nor even researches into the interests and desires of the pupils, which may, indeed, be insufficient guides, but teachers at least as well prepared to put into effective practice the changing conception of culture as

were or still are the teachers of the traditional conception. Only on this condition can the United States furnish to the world an example of quality in education comparable to the opportunities so manifold in quantity, which has won the admiration of the world. Here lies the real challenge to American secondary education.

STANDARDS OF ACHIEVEMENT IN EUROPEAN AND AMERICAN SECONDARY SCHOOLS*

THERE appears to be developing in this country a feeling that in education our problems are unique, that we have developed a system which, in comparison with the educational systems of other countries, has reached perfection, and that from the point of view of democracy in education little is to be learned from foreign practices. Even if these claims were sound, it would represent a type of provincialism that in the field of intellectual endeavor is dangerous. Fortunately, however, there is developing everywhere a feeling of unrest, a feeling that in spite of the remarkable illustration given to the world in the organization and support of a democratic system of education, much remains to be done in the way of improvement. This unrest arises largely from a recognition that while in our educational organization we have thought in terms of quantity, in terms of providing an education for all who seek it, the same thought has not been given to the improvement of standards and to raising the quality of education. De Tocqueville with great foresight anticipated some such result nearly a century ago, when he prophesied that the greatest danger to which a democratic system of education is exposed is the cult of mediocrity. It may at the outset be admitted that the general principles on which our high school and college education is based are sound,

* Lecture delivered before the New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Hartford, Conn., May 7, 1927, and printed in *School and Society*, Vol. XXVI, No. 660, August 20, 1927, pp. 217 ff.

without granting that the execution is the best that can be found.

The outstanding feature in the educational progress of European countries since the War is the prevalence of widespread unrest, but an unrest that differs from that in the United States because of their preoccupation with the problem of increasing educational opportunities. Everywhere the most serious discussions center round the desire to put into effect the democratic demand of educational opportunity for all by the establishment of a common school system. But whatever solution the future may bring, and that future depends as much on sound financial and economic conditions as on educational theory, the American solution of one institution for the education of all adolescents will be rejected. The basis of educational reconstruction on democratic principles will in European countries be founded on a recognition of the fact that democracy in education does not mean identity but variety of opportunity suited to the varied abilities of the pupils. Ability is to be encouraged wherever it is found, but unlike our American practice education above elementary will be organized on a functional basis with provision for transfer from one institution to another.

Something of the kind has already been done in France by articulating elementary and secondary schools and higher elementary, technical and secondary schools with one another, and by the institution of a large number of scholarships. Somewhat similar is the provision made in the German schools with the additional establishment of a new type of secondary school for late arrivals. In England one of the most significant semi-official reports published in recent years is that on the *Education of the Adolescent*, which outlines a complete reorganization of the system into primary and secondary education, the latter to be provided in a variety of school types. From the point of view of democracy in education the European countries are very much alive to the problems before them.

Educational opportunity, then, is to be provided but through a variety of school types rather than by means of a single institution like our high school. The little that is gained through avoidance of overlapping and unity of organization in this country will be compensated on the other side by a clear demarcation of functions and objectives. The American plan has in fact been considered and rejected as making for mediocrity. And the question may well be raised whether many non-academic courses in the American high schools have not been diluted over a period similar in length to that of the academic courses without more justification than mere juxtaposition.

Secondary education in the European countries retains its traditional connotation of that education which is based on a course of academic subjects, including two foreign languages, ancient or modern. It has another connotation in being definitely selective, an aim which is rejected in this country by those who ignore the large number of students in the high schools who fail to graduate. The chief difference in execution is that in this country we allow our students to fumble around until they find the standard and combination of subjects that suit them, while in the European schools and courses of different types the standard remains unalterably fixed. It may be conceded that such standards are disastrous in individual cases and especially in countries where social stratification and privileges that accompany education are as strong as they ever were, but the fact is that the standards exist.

Within comparable types of schools or courses fundamental differences emerge. The most important of these is the precision with which courses have been organized in the foreign countries. Foreign languages constitute the differentials between the courses, but in all of them a varying degree of emphasis is placed on the vernacular, history and geography, mathematics and sciences. Each of these subjects begins in the first year and is continued for four to nine years; a balance

is preserved between the different subjects and provision is made for expansion and growth according to the advancing maturity of the pupils. At the close of each year and at least twice during the whole course examinations are conducted to test the ability of the pupil to continue.

Compare this with the system of education on the credit plan adopted in this country. The provision made for continuity in the study of subjects is virtually negligible, examinations are conducted by the teacher who gives the course, and at no point in the course is the student called upon either to take a comprehensive view of what he has studied or to show evidence of retention. Graduation is evidence of exposure to a number of subjects, each valued at so many points, all summed up in a system of bookkeeping. If a student is unhappy in one subject, he may drop that and find joy in another; the calculation of substitutions that are possible in a high school course would probably tax an expert mathematician. As for the results, let the college teachers speak, as, indeed, they have done at Purdue University in a report on freshman English, with samples that can be called English only by courtesy.

The American system both of high school and of college education is framed on the principle that "any subject pursued for the same length of time under competent teachers is as good as any other," a principle in which the only feature that is standardized is the time element. This principle that "pushpin is as good as poetry" would never be accepted in a European secondary school, and, even if it were true from the point of view of mental training, it leaves out of consideration much that is valuable in education. The American student is exposed to an educational cafeteria, with an adviser no doubt, but still a cafeteria; the European has a table d'hôte set before him, carefully balanced, not as is generally supposed with a view to college entrance but with the idea that there are certain elements in human knowledge with which an educated man should be familiar. At the same time

these elements are selected on the "effete" principle that they may also train the mind! Definiteness, restriction, and continuity characterize secondary courses in the European schools; vagueness, extensiveness, and choppiness, added up to so many credits, mark the American high school courses.

So much for organization; but the real emphasis in European schools is not laid on organization, on an efficiency system in which one subject has to be made of equal value with another, but on the teacher. It would be interesting if, instead of discussing the value or popularity of this or that subject, an effort were made to devote more attention than we do to the preparation of the teachers behind the subjects. There are many studies today that indicate the presence of teachers in high schools teaching subjects not merely in which they have had little preparation but in which they have had no preparation at all. Except in a few English schools, and those not under the purview of the Board of Education, such a situation is impossible in European secondary schools. There all teachers must be specifically prepared both in the special subjects that they profess to teach and in subjects allied to them. In some countries they may be deficient in training in methods and education, but surely the advantage must lie with the teacher who is a master of his subject rather than with the teacher who obtains his certificate on fulfilling a requirement of eighteen or twenty points in education with little or nothing said about command of subject matter. The provision of the North Central Association that teachers should *as far as possible* be assigned to teach subjects that they have studied in college would be unintelligible to a foreigner.

These are the main features that make for differences in standards of achievement, features that affect the whole spirit of secondary education abroad. More specifically, however, there are other factors that are in favor of the European systems on this point. In all cases secondary education begins earlier by at least two years in England,

three years in France, and four years in Germany than it does in our traditional four-year high school. The school week and the school year are somewhat longer and the probability is that the hours for homework are greater than is customary with us. Any summary, however brief, of the content of the courses of study in the English, French, or German schools is impossible here. For the last two countries they have been made available by the International Institute of Teachers College. An examination, no matter how cursory, will reveal that the courses in English are fuller, more extensive, and richer than many courses found in our colleges; in history every student becomes a master of the history of his own country and familiar with world history; geography, a subject whose value is not recognized for high school purposes, supplements history and reaches out into economics; in the sciences the European student may not attain facility in manipulative exercises but he does acquire a good knowledge of theory, and somehow or other Europe does produce its share of eminent scientists; mathematics reaches out into much of the work that is done in the American college. Finally, the real test is the ability of the student in each country to handle his own language, an emphasis that is too sadly lacking in every stage of our education.

Specifically a comparison can be instituted between the English and the American schools. In the English schools the majority of the students are submitted at the end of the first four years, that is, at about the age of sixteen, to what is known as the First Schools Examination, conducted by a variety of external agencies. The content and standard of this examination are approximately equal to our college entrance requirements. Students who pass this examination with high grades may be exempted from the university matriculation examination. Very few proceed to the universities at this stage; many leave school altogether; many remain and begin to specialize along one or other academic line. The standards of achievement of students in French

and German schools at the age of sixteen would probably be a little higher, at any rate from the point of view of ground covered.

As for those who graduate from the secondary schools of Germany and France the comparison is clear. Committees on equivalents, appointed some years ago by the American Council of Education, have recommended that such graduates be admitted to the junior year of an American college, a practice that has generally been adopted. Similar provision could probably be made for individual English students.

The European student, if the case has been made out, is thus at least two years in advance of the American high school student. Admitted that the European student is a selected product, there is sufficient evidence to show that the high school graduate from an academic course is also selected as the result of a variety of causes that do not enter in the European situation. Some twenty-five years ago Presidents Eliot and Butler drew attention to this difference as it manifested itself in the age of entrance into professional work. At that time the junior high school had not emerged. With the rapid spread and development of the junior high school, there is no reason any longer for retarding the abler students. Adequate progress has been made with intelligence and other tests to select a sufficiently numerous student body in the larger high schools not for rapid advancement but for intensive treatment. The American and English students show a healthy resistance to overwork and there is adequate evidence that there is no danger of overburdening boys or girls by completing the present high school requirements by sixteen. The next step beyond this is not to send such students to college but to bring the college to them. The introduction of junior college work into the high school for those who are known to be capable of profiting thereby is the logical corollary to the establishment of the high school. Then only will the American high school be on a par with European secondary schools. Although we are veering very close to

it, it has yet to be proved that democracy and quality in education are incompatible. The student of ability has as great a claim for advancing at his pace as the mediocre and average students have to be mothered to accumulate the precious credits that total up to graduation. The American high school, it is true, is burdened with a multifarious task which in Europe is distributed among a variety of schools, but it can be and should be sufficiently elastic and flexible to provide the best intellectual training for its abler students. It has an opportunity today of proving that the cult of mediocrity is not necessarily the consequence of democratic education.

EDUCATION IN LATIN-AMERICAN COUNTRIES*

Not the least important of the many ramifications of the recently developed interest in international affairs is the desire to know something about the provisions made in different parts of the world for the education of oncoming generations. In the case of the Latin-American countries, special significance attaches to this interest because of our increasing relations with them politically and economically, and on the other side because of the interest of the Latin-Americans in our political and cultural organization. On both sides of the Panama Canal there are gross misunderstandings and serious misconceptions, on the one hand, of the political aims of this country, and on the other, of the status and development of the countries to the south of us. In both cases, attitudes and prejudices are developed that are the result of ignorance. Too often our notions of the Latin-American countries are colored, not by things as they are, but by conditions that have been; while in the Latin-American countries they are affected by contacts with individuals who may or may not be adequate representatives of our civilization.

The approach to an understanding that is made through a study of educational systems is one of the most enlightening because it involves a study of all the factors—historical, social, political, and economic—that go into the making of an

* Lecture delivered in Schoolmen's Week, University of Pennsylvania, March 30, 1927, and printed in the *Fourteenth Annual Schoolmen's Week Proceedings.*

educational system. In considering the educational status of the Latin-American countries, it is important to remember that they are, from the point of view of political stability, young countries, although politically independent for over a century. Even the most advanced of them has only been free from factional strife for less than fifty years. Further, they are nearly all sparsely populated, and lack good means of communication and adequate means of transportation. Moreover, the political unrest of the nineteenth century provided opportunities for foreign capital to fasten its hold and to develop some of the countries in the interests, not of the native, but of the foreigner.

Yet in spite of these unpropitious factors, the countries, certainly those with whom this paper is most concerned, have developed cultures, modes of thought, and ways of living distinctly independent of the mother countries from which they have come. Again, with the more recent increase of immigration, they are on the eve of a more distinctive cultural development than ever before. In the same way, education is in process of development, seeking the best influences that can be found elsewhere and moulding them to suit the local conditions.

To take any one of the four countries under consideration —Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina, and Chile—the most outstanding characteristic in the organization of education is centralization of control, whether in the hands of the central government or in those of the provincial authorities. In all the four countries another feature is the separation in administration of different branches of education. Finally must be mentioned the absence of public participation in education. Education is an affair of governments and bureaucracies, not of public opinion.

Looked at historically, centralization of administration, whether in the hands of the state or of its major divisions, was the only solution, partly on account of sparsity of population, partly because a strong central authority alone

could hold the balance between conflicting interests of party politics and of religious and lay influences. For contrary to general preconceptions, education in the four countries has been laicized, even though religious instruction may still be given in some of them.

Hence educational control is more or less effectively centralized in the hands of a Minister of Public Instruction and Justice, or in Brazil, of the Minister of the Interior. More or less effectively, for except in Brazil, the Minister is responsible only for the general supervision of education, without any participation in the details of administration. In Argentina and Brazil, the provision of education is left to the provinces or the states, but even here there is considerable overlapping between the central and local authorities. So strongly entrenched is the acceptance of governmental action and centralization that there is a tendency for the local divisions to look to the central government for support and help. As a result, in both countries the central governments maintain national elementary schools in the provinces or states, giving aid under certain conditions, chiefly that the local authorities devote ten per cent of their revenue to education. In the same way there is overlapping in the provision of industrial and agricultural schools. The result is that instead of decreasing, central control is increasing at the expense of local initiative, and the central government must distribute its benefits impartially, irrespective of adaptability or needs. Hence there is a tendency to uniformity on the one hand and waste on the other.

But it is especially in the field of secondary education that this uniformity becomes most striking, for secondary education as the gateway to higher professional education and as the branch first recognized as important for the education of leaders was taken wholly under the wing of the central governments. Thus in the Argentine, although provincial authorities may establish secondary and normal schools, little use is made of the privilege because the central government is

expected to carry the load; in Brazil, on the other hand, the federal government, although it has established and maintains only one secondary school, controls all the rest throughout the country.

It is this tendency to look to the central government, which feeds on itself, that is the least promising feature of politics and administration in Latin America. Some of the reasons for it have already been given; another is the centralization of wealth in the capitals where, in consequence, ability and intellect also tend to concentrate. Accompanying, and as a result of such concentration of power in the hands of the central government and the virtual negation of public initiative and appeal, is the executive and legislative authority of the Ministers and Parliament. In general the need of appealing to the public is not felt; a Minister has the technical right to change the educational system overnight, provided that he can secure the signature of the President. His successor has the same right, and every Minister seeks to leave his mark on education in some such way as this. While in the United States and England educational progress is a matter of slow and deliberate modification of public opinion and a consequent reform that may survive, the Latin-American governments proceed by direct action. A project for a bill is presented and may become a law by executive action of the President and his Minister or by legislative action of Parliament. Project succeeds project, and activity leads to further activity, but this does not necessarily mean that there is action. Statute books are full of good laws that have not been effective because they are too far ahead of public opinion. Thus the whole systems of intermediate and secondary education in the Argentine were changed overnight by the Minister of Public Instruction in 1916 and were changed back in the following year by his successor as soon as he went out of office.

So much for general practices. Beyond this each branch of education is administered by a separate council and an

independent staff of officers. Thus there is a separate council for secondary education, a separate council for elementary education, a separate council for industrial education, and still another for agricultural education. Each branch is organized on parallel lines and they rarely meet. This means wastefulness and lack of articulation. In each branch everything is centralized—curricula, courses of study, textbooks, equipment. All teachers are appointed by the central office and all correspondence on the most trivial matters passes through the hands of the appropriate director, whose time is frequently consumed with that and little else, leaving but slight scope for constructive effort.

Secondary education is everywhere administered by such a council, and in three of the countries, Uruguay, Chile, and Brazil, by a council that also administers higher education. Hence the function of secondary education is to prepare for the universities by which it is dominated. Curricula, courses of study, textbooks, and methods are uniform; the only feature in which uniformity is lacking is the teaching personnel. For while most teachers are university graduates, only a minority are professional teachers, coming to the schools for their allotted periods and pursuing some other profession at the same time. Although from the point of view of educational opportunity, secondary education is free, or virtually free, a rigid, uniform curriculum negates this opportunity and spells a high rate of mortality. The only outlet is to the universities; those who fail are not prepared for any walk in life and, like most educated Latin Americans, look to government positions for their career.

Bound by a conception of culture that is admittedly academic in character, that is no more closely related to modern needs and requirements than when it originated, secondary education is regarded as a sieve for the selection of the future leaders of the country. But this selection is measured wholly by ability to amass a fixed quantum of information and readiness to produce it at the annual examinations. All are

measured by the same test, and those who cannot meet it are cast out, so that less than twenty-five per cent survive to graduate and enter the universities. The teachers are drawn from all manner of professions, and while masters of their subjects are, in the main, innocent of the technique of teaching. The method of instruction is still individual in the sense that coöperative classwork is practically unknown; the teacher lectures, the individual pupil recites to the teacher, not to the class. Chile alone has a sound system of teacher preparation, but here, too, the emphasis is on examinations and amassing information. Other ends than the purely academic are unknown; extra-curricular activities and athletics are not only non-existent but even discouraged. This is the equipment given to the future leaders in these countries; methods of instructions and examinations emphasize individualism and competition, and nowhere is any active effort made to form character. Hence the inability of leaders in politics or in professions to coöperate; hence the worship of the word, written or spoken; hence a wealth of ideas and poverty in action. Because such leaders are in control, the system of secondary education is perpetuated in a vicious circle.

Industrial and agricultural education have been provided, but only in a few places are they accepted seriously, and there excellent work is being done. The fact is that the parent who is willing to keep his child at school always prefers the secondary school—the avenue to the professions and government positions—to a training in manual activities. It is the antipathy to manual work among the middle classes that is another retarding factor which militates against the best efforts to develop higher technical and agricultural work.

The greatest progress has been made in the field of elementary education. This is relative only, for the percentage of illiteracy still ranges from thirty to seventy-five. Compulsory education has in general but recently been introduced and the supply of school buildings is considerably less than

the need. The majority of the pupils in the elementary schools attend for only four years, while only the cities provide a full six-year course. The greatest hope lies, however, in the spirit of elementary education. In the first place the majority of the teachers are trained; in the second, elementary education, unlike secondary, is free from politics, and is professionalized; in the third, elementary education is marked by a tradition of loyalty and enthusiasm borrowed from the United States in Horace Mann's days by Sarmiento in the Argentine and Varela in Uruguay, and introduced by a number of American normal school women in all four countries; fourthly, the problem of teaching the fundamentals because of the metric system and the simplicity of the language is not so great as in this country. But the elementary schools have caught the spirit of modern development; curricula are being modernized, courses of study reformed and adapted to the needs of the child, and active methods of instruction introduced; combined with all these features, standards of thoroughness have been retained. At the present time, more is to be hoped from elementary education in the Latin-American countries than from any other branch.

Thus it is through elementary education that a generation is being trained to work and think for itself; a much-needed program of health education is being expanded through the elementary schools; and in these schools pupils are being taught something of the meaning of coöperation, the absence of which is perhaps one of the most serious defects in all the countries. More important than these are two other movements; one is the organization of parents' meetings and associations which in time will develop public opinion and lay the basis for a more democratic form of administration; the other is a tendency to break down the system of uniformity and the devolution to local bodies of teachers of the right to make their own courses of study. It is among elementary teachers under expert leadership that a genuine interest in education as a science is slowly manifesting itself. It is to

this activity that interest in what is happening abroad, in the newer tendencies in method, in the application of scientific measurement in education, is due. Given a sounder financial basis for education which in the long run can come only through an educated public and not from centralized bureaucracies, the Latin-American countries have in the elementary schools one of the most hopeful foundations for their future.

It is not for the foreigner to indicate the needs of another country. In the case of all these countries, there is an adequate supply of critics who see their own failings as well as the foreigner can. To these the chief defects center around the supply of adequate types of education at the adolescent stage, a reform of secondary education that would deflect students from academic professions and government employment into the economic work of each country, the training of character in action, habits of coöperation, health and physical activities. The countries are all blessed with great natural resources. If these are not being developed, it is due not to racial characteristics, but to a type of education which, beyond the elementary, has been one of tradition rather than of adaptation and adjustment. As in the case of elementary education in the middle of the nineteenth century, so in secondary these countries are awaiting a leader who will have the ability to put sound ideas into practice. In the Argentine the effort was made in 1916; it will, no doubt, be made again and again, until it meets with success because of public opinion awakened through the elementary schools. From the point of view of administration the most impressive lessons from a study of educational organization in the Latin-American countries are the dependence of educational progress on public opinion and support and the almost stagnating influence of centralization and uniformity.

EDUCATIONAL REFORM IN MEXICO*

In the vast number of educational experiments that are now proceeding throughout the world none is more far-reaching and interesting than that which has been proceeding in Mexico in the past five years. Perhaps because of the proximity of our neighbor, perhaps because of the tendency of the press to direct attention to the more sensational and more ephemeral incidents of the Revolution in Mexico little interest has been shown in the less spectacular and more fundamental and promising features of the reforms that have been undertaken by her farsighted leaders. The Revolution, a name applied to the whole movement of the past ten years for the establishment of sound government and the cultivation of a national consciousness in Mexico, has been marked by a series of reforms in a wide range of national activities. Of these education has been regarded as one of the most important. In her attempt to develop a stable government Mexico has been confronted with a number of serious problems. Her attempt to deal with the clerical problem is known to all; this has not been an anti-religious movement so much as a movement to eliminate the Church from politics. Confronted with two classes of unprivileged groups, the rural and the urban, Mexico has sought to incorporate into her citizenship the former by a scheme of land distribution and the latter by a series of measures for the protection of the indus-

* Lecture to the students in Education S. 100 in the Columbia University Summer Session, 1928.

trial workers. Conscious of her own resources and the dangers that would accrue to the country from continued exploitation of these by foreign capital, legislation was passed to protect the country's interests. Education has been recognized by all the enlightened leaders as a problem that affects all of these and as offering the best solution for the country's welfare. For the problem is fundamentally one of building up a national spirit and a national attitude on the one hand and of incorporating into the nation the large masses of the unprivileged who have hitherto been depressed and in a state of peonage. The importance of education had already been recognized by President Obregon, and this interest was continued by President Calles, who thus summarized the situation:

> The fundamental bases of the improvement of the great communities of my country, and especially the rural masses, workers and natives, are their economic liberation and educational development, their complete incorporation into civilized life. The problem of land solved as I have indicated elsewhere and in a way that will increase agricultural production and bring about the economic emancipation of the rural population, and the consolidation of the rights and the legal protection of the working classes in the cities and industrial centers,—all these will be the predominant keynotes of my administration, which beyond this has to develop on the basis of justice and equity to all classes of society.

The educational problem was not a simple one. Of the population of sixteen million about one-half are pure Indian, divided into groups speaking a great variety of dialects and with Spanish as the only possible common bond, a language of which many are still ignorant; more than half of the population are of mixed blood; the small remainder are Spanish or of Spanish descent. The average percentage of illiteracy is 65 per cent, rising in some parts of the country to 88 per cent. About 95 per cent of the rural population ekes out an exist-

ence below the subsistence level. The lot of the industrial workers in the towns is frequently not much better.

The first Constitution following the Revolution left the provision of education to the states. Their neglect of the problem, due in part to lack of resources, in part to indifference, led to an amendment of the Constitution in 1921 whereby the federal government was permitted to provide schools where the states had failed to do so and to establish model schools in strategic centers. But it was not only the lack of schools that needed to be remedied; the schools themselves needed the guidance of educators who were willing to depart from the traditional emphasis on book work and the three R's, which was and still is characteristic of many of the schools provided by the states.

The federal government began its reform in 1924 by encouraging the establishment of schools especially in the rural areas and proceeded at the rate of opening about a thousand schools a year, a rate which, to my knowledge, has not been surpassed anywhere. The schools are, of course, unpretentious; often they consist of teachers and pupils under any kind of shelter that could be improvised. The important point, however, is that the establishment of schools has already led to a demand for more on the part of the so-called illiterate peons. Recognizing that the possession of the land which the government has distributed can only be turned to good account through education, the first thing for which the local committees petition is a school.

This demand for schools is not merely imitative, based on a desire to have what has already been obtained by a neighboring community. It is due to the ability of the educational leaders to convey to the masses the meaning and significance of education. For it is not by the mere establishment of schools that the authorities expect to reconstruct Mexican society. The appeal to the intelligence of the masses is based on the new and broader conception of education that inspires the leaders. They do not conceive of education

merely in terms of literacy, of reading, writing, and arithmetic. The function of the school that they recognize is that it is to teach the people how to live, how to meet physical and social needs, how to develop a consciousness of rights and duties. Hence the emphasis is placed on health, shelter, food, farming, small industries, and the traditional heritage. In the full enthusiasm of its mission the Department of Education attempted to introduce the project method by decree, with humorous results in many cases; a start was, however, made with an activity rather than a book program. The school was expected to become the social center of the community,—to serve children of school age during the day and adults in the evenings. Provision was made for the creation of small libraries in each school. Side by side with the program for the education of children a scheme for adult education and for the preservation and promotion of native arts and industries was begun. The grant of land to each rural school made it possible in another way to come closer to the parents by introducing agriculture, gardening, and the care of animals into the curriculum.

The most serious problem was the supply of teachers. At first the experiment had to be begun with young men and women who had had scarcely more than four years of elementary education themselves, but who were possessed of good-will and inspired by the same missionary zeal as their leaders. The difficulty was all the greater because the majority of the teachers were isolated in single-teacher schools. The situation was met in a statesmanlike way, which recalls the best efforts of Horace Mann and Henry Barnard to improve the standards of the untrained teachers of their day, but which in the breadth of its conception far surpassed anything that was done in their teachers' institutes. In 1926 cultural missions were established and distributed in different parts of the country, which had been divided into zones for the purpose. The staff of each mission consists of an educator as general organizer, professors of agriculture,

small industries, drawing, music, physical education, and a social worker. Each mission settles in a convenient center for a period of three weeks, the teachers of the neighborhood are called in, and the whole group organizes itself for coöperative living on a simple but comfortable level. The character and work of the mission are such as to appeal to the interests of the whole locality and nothing affords better evidence of this than the readiness of the inhabitants to coöperate in any little way that they can. Through their participation in the domestic arrangements the students receive some training in household arts. The functions of the members of the staff are clear; the organizer is responsible for simple lessons in educational theory and demonstration lessons in the local school; the professor of agriculture gives instruction in gardening and simple farming; the professor of small industries introduces the students to canning, soap-making, manual work in wood and iron, tanning, and clay modeling; the social worker gives lessons in social work and social welfare, in first aid, and in inoculation. All the work is kept at as simple a level as possible and is eminently practical in character. The training given by the cultural missions is continued by the local inspectors who visit the teachers in their schools and themselves also conduct conferences.

The organization of the cultural missions was introduced as a temporary measure to meet an emergency situation; their success will undoubtedly mean their continuance in the future. In the meantime there have also been established special normal schools for the preparation of rural school teachers. Boys who are fifteen years of age, and girls who are fourteen, are admitted on the completion of four years of elementary education to the two-year courses offered by the normal schools. The course includes language, arithmetic and geometry, social sciences (geography, history, and civics), singing, physical education, writing and drawing, domestic economy, farm work, and shop work; the professional training includes courses on rural life, child study,

principles of education, methods, observation and practice teaching. The general aim of the preparation is to train teachers who will be able to make peasants out of peons.

In the urban centers of the Federal District, which is under the sole charge of the Federal Department of Education, and in model schools established by the government outside the District, the same general principles of education are followed as in the rural schools. The aim is to develop, through an activity program, a sense of personal responsibility. Here, too, much attention has been given to shop work, gardening, care of animals, the organization of libraries, museums and collections of various kinds, and to games. In many schools coöperative societies have been established among the pupils, partly to train them in habits of thrift, partly to reduce the cost of school supplies to the pupils by purchasing them in large quantities, and partly to train the pupils in the moral habits of coöperation. Parents' associations have been established not only to educate the parents in the meaning of the new school and to secure their coöperation and support, but also as an effective agency of educating the adults themselves. Through the pupils and through the parents' associations it is hoped to improve standards of living, clothing, diet, and health. The most marked step for the improvement of schools has been the adoption of open-air buildings, which are not only cheaper than the ordinary type of building but more sanitary. These new schools have adequate playground space, part of it often laid out in gardens, tended by the pupils themselves, and several of them are equipped with swimming pools. Not only are the schools beautiful architecturally, but some of them have been fortunate in being adorned with the work of some of Mexico's leading painters. The new style of school architecture has many advantages, but one is especially emphasized by one of the leaders in Mexico's educational revival—the school is open to the world, the pupils are not shut off from it and the passer-by may look into the school.

The model schools established outside the Federal District are organized on the same general principles as the schools of the district. Their influence in different parts of the country varies with the interest of the local administrative authorities; in some areas they have already led to important local reforms in the schools; in others the teachers and inspectors stand aloof from the new experiment.

In the field of secondary education progress has been somewhat slower, as might be expected. Secondary education in Mexico has had the same tradition as it has had in other Latin American countries. It was for the few and directed wholly to the preparation of students for the universities. It has lacked a full-time teaching staff and the methods have been mainly characterized by lectures and cramming. A thoroughgoing reform was possible only in the Federal District, where a beginning was made by the establishment of four junior high schools which are to be later expanded into six-year schools. The new schools, modeled entirely on similar schools in the United States, met with instant success and were inadequate to accommodate all who sought admission. The experiment is important not only for Mexico but for the whole of Latin America, since it introduces an entirely new conception of education for the adolescent. Its importance does not lie so much in the attempt to organize a full-time profession of secondary school teachers, nor in the introduction of new curricula and methods of instruction, but in the frank recognition of the place of manual activities for education. The introduction of extra-curricular activities, sports and games, outdoor activities, camping and hiking is for a Latin American country an innovation that has never been associated before, except in rare instances, with secondary education.

For the improvement of secondary education in general in the country the federal government has introduced a system of accrediting which will in time lead not only to an improvement of buildings and equipment but also to the

raising of standards of the personnel and methods of instruction. In the federal capital courses have been established both for the preparation of secondary school teachers and for the training of teachers in service.

To the efforts of the authorities for the encouragement and preservation of folk arts and industries, which by the curious paradox of modern civilization are likely to stagnate before the advance of formal school education, reference has already been made. The wealth of talent possessed by Mexico is nowhere better illustrated than in the Open Air Schools of Art and in the Open Air School of Sculpture which have been developed in the capital by the Department of Education. Nowhere is the maxim that the teacher makes the school better illustrated. Here are institutions with no entrance requirements, no age limit, nothing demanded but a desire for artistic expression through the medium of painting or sculpture. The pupils range through all ages from seven to seventy. All that the schools provide is the opportunity and the inspiration and suggestion of the teachers. And yet teaching as such, methods of instruction as such, seem to be absent; the teachers cannot explain what they do or how they achieve results, many of which have been crowned with prizes at the Paris salons. There is something in these schools that defies explanation in the ordinary jargon of education; there is here an illustration of what Gentile means when he talks of education as a communion of life between the teacher and the pupil. There too is evidence of the latent ability that Mexico is discovering in her hitherto inarticulate masses.

It is no easy task that Mexico has undertaken; it is more than merely an educational reform. Mexico takes her place side by side with some of the new European democracies which have recognized the importance of education in building up a nation out of the heterogeneous masses of their populations and welding a whole out of the different cultural levels of their peoples in the face of political, religious, and

economic conflicts. No more fitting summary of the efforts that Mexico is making can be given than that of Dewey: "I wish to go further and say that there is nowhere in the world movement of education an aspect of a greater intimacy and spiritual union between the scholastic activities and those of the community than that which is seen now in Mexico."

ASPECTS OF SECONDARY EDUCATION*

I

Education for Selection

May I express my deep appreciation of the opportunity afforded to me of acquainting myself with the educational situation in Mexico? The university to which I have the honor to belong has had close connections with your educational system. Through Dr. Monroe, Dr. Dewey, Dean Russell, and Dr. Wilson on the one side and through Rector Pruneda, Mr. Saenz, Dr. Barranco, and the group of twelve professors of your secondary schools we have, I hope, begun to appreciate the educational efforts and aspirations of the two countries.

The problem that I propose to discuss in the present series of lectures, the problem of secondary education, is one that is today in the forefront of all the educational questions that are facing the countries of the world. In the field of elementary or primary education the general lines have been laid down and through nearly a century of practice and experimentation the main needs have come to be appreciated. Elementary education, indeed, has been less subject to traditions and has on the whole been more flexible than secondary education. In the latter field tradition has been much stronger and, although protests and criticisms have always

* The following four lectures were delivered in Spanish at the University of Mexico in 1927 and were published by the Ministry of Public Instruction under the title *Conferencias sobre la Educación Secundaria.*

been heard, changes and modifications were less frequent, and the general conception of secondary education remained virtually unmodified from the beginning of its modern development in the sixteenth century down to the close of the nineteenth. We stand today in a period of transition which began some thirty years ago almost simultaneously in France, Germany, England, and the United States. The present is, thus, a period of unrest which began with a protest against the classical tradition until today the nature of the attack has been completely transformed. The problem is no longer approached from the point of view of subject values but is colored rather by consideration of national, social, economic, and political requirements. To some extent this method of approach is a post-War development, but the War only intensified a movement already under way.

This movement will, I hope, become clear in the analysis of some typical systems of secondary education. Beginning with a consideration of secondary education in some South American countries, a system that is designed deliberately for selection, I will take up in turn the French system of selection of an intellectual élite, the German system which is aiming at the development of a new national culture, the English system which aims to combine the best traditions of character-formation with an education adapted to individual needs and capacities, and the system of the United States, which through her secondary schools is attempting to develop a new conception of culture adapted to the needs of a modern democratic society. Through all these systems I hope to show there runs a new orientation which seems to point in a new direction and which will undoubtedly mark a new era in the development of secondary education.

The first type of secondary education that I wish to consider is that most prevalent in the countries of South America, such as Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Uruguay. In spite of certain differences between these countries, the educational characteristics are not at all dissimilar.

From the point of view of administration and organization the schools of these countries are very similar. In general, although built up on and closely articulated with the elementary schools, secondary education is under a separate and distinct administration—in Uruguay and Chile closely affiliated with the University, in the Argentine directly under the Ministry of Public Instruction, in Brazil under a special Council. This separation in administration means lack of continuity between elementary and secondary education and often a gulf between the two. The length of the secondary course is generally six years, the pupils entering at about the age of twelve. In the Argentine the course, except in three special schools, is five years in length; in Uruguay the course is divided into four years of general secondary education and two years of preparatory work varying with the faculty to be entered.

The teachers are in the majority of cases university graduates, but only in Chile is there a systematic plan of professional training, which has been in existence for nearly forty years. While opportunities for professional preparation exist in Argentina, the majority of the teachers are untrained.

The proportion of pupils in the secondary schools to pupils in the elementary schools is roughly the same, from one per cent to a little over two per cent.

Secondary education in these countries exists very definitely as an instrument for the selection of those who shall proceed to the universities and thence to the higher professional and liberal careers. For this purpose certain traditional subjects of instruction—languages, mathematics, history, geography, and sciences—constitute a fixed and uniform curriculum as the basis of examinations. Two traditions have combined to produce the secondary schools found today—the practice of the old teaching orders and the influence of positivism. From the one has survived an emphasis on instruction and mental training alone, from the other a logical organization of subject matter with a complete disre-

gard of the needs of the individual, of varied abilities and capacities, and of the requirements of modern society. To the Latin-American educator the cultured man is he who can speak and read one, perhaps two, modern foreign languages; in practice this usually means ability to speak French, an ability not always secured in the secondary schools. The major portion of the curriculum is devoted to language. Other subjects are subordinate to this work, and, although sciences and mathematics, history and geography are included, the emphasis is always not on their value for enriching experience, but rather on the accumulation of knowledge, facts, and information. Now knowledge is undoubtedly of the greatest importance, but only if it can be applied or used. Unfortunately its presentation is governed by two aims—first, preparation for examinations and ability to reproduce on call; and, second, in the later stages in some cases, the requirements of the faculty of the university that the pupil is to enter. Thus in the end, whatever cultural claims may be made, secondary education is dominated by examinations and by the university faculties. The conception of culture on which the curriculum under discussion is based tends to become artificial and lifeless, with an emphasis on the subjects themselves rather than on the dynamic qualities that culture should imply, that is, something cultivated, something growing.

In the systems under consideration the individual tends to be submerged in the interests of the subjects, which have become static, and the culture of the individual is measured not in terms of what he can do, but rather in terms of ability to reproduce what he has acquired either from lectures or from books. This conception involves also the disciplinary notion, that mere exposure to the traditional subjects means a trained mind and, therefore, ability to undertake any kind of intellectual or practical activity that may present itself.

The question may be approached from still another point

of view. The systems under consideration profess to impart a general liberal education and to use that as an instrument for the selection of an élite. Both objects are to be attained by a single curriculum that is uniform in all the secondary schools of each country. The history of secondary education and the experience of the leading countries of the world in the last thirty years tend to disprove the possibility of this attempt. The psychology of individual differences is nowhere taken into account and proposals to introduce differentiated courses, even within the traditional conception of culture, have been opposed as undemocratic. To a large degree the uniform curriculum is responsible for the high percentage of failures, for cramming, for learning by memory, for devotion to books rather than to ideas and practical situations. The systems are no doubt selective, but the survivors represent a narrow and limited range of interests and abilities.

This conception of the curriculum has its counterpart in the methods of instruction. In Europe in the hands of reformers even the traditional subjects have been adapted to the abilities of individual pupils and to throw light on modern problems. Nothing of this kind has yet been done in the countries under consideration, except perhaps in Chile. Pupils are organized in classes but for the teacher they exist simply as units; classwork or socialized recitation, and group activity or the application of knowledge acquired to new problems, are unknown. The usual procedure is for the teacher to break new ground in a lecture of one period's duration, following generally the purely logical organization of a textbook, for the pupils to sit back and listen, and for the teacher to ask individual pupils to repeat the content of the lecture at a subsequent period. Such a method makes for docility and memorization; it does not inculcate methods of study and investigation; it fails to encourage an interchange of ideas; and, finally, it does not stimulate curiosity, inquiry, or questioning.

This method is further sanctioned by the exigencies of the examination system. The pressure of the annual examinations, even though they are in some instances relieved from the domination of the universities and entrusted to the teachers, is undoubtedly strong in the minds of teachers, parents, and pupils. Good marks obtained by a pupil during the year may be made nugatory by a poor showing in an examination of half an hour. The examination is undoubtedly intended to be a vigorous sieve, but it places too great a premium on memory to the detriment of other intellectual qualities. If he works at all, a pupil does so in the month preceding the examination and then his efforts are directed to committing the subjects of the year to memory. It is stated universally by teachers that the period following the examinations is one for forgetting what has been so arduously memorized, while in the special professional faculties the complaint is frequently made that the work of the lower schools could not always be relied upon.

This account is not intended as a reflection on the teachers; almost without exception they are thorough masters of their subjects. Their failure is due to the absence, first, of professional preparation (except in Chile), and, secondly, of a teaching profession as such. Hence the teachers are interested in their subjects and not in the pupils as living, growing personalities; their aim is to see that the pupils meet the requirements for admission to the universities instead of developing their capacities for service in the various activities of citizenship and life. The examinations, since they are looked upon as the logical culmination of the courses, are regarded not as a test of the teachers, but rather of the pupils, and, if they fail, the responsibility is theirs and not the teachers'. *Caveat alumnus!*

The serious side of the absence of a teaching profession is that it perpetuates a divorce between instruction and education, between accumulation of knowledge for its own sake and the total development of character through the har-

monious application of knowledge to practical social ends. The result is that each subject is an entity in itself without any connection with other subjects or with any ultimate end that a sound philosophy of education may set up.

There is throughout an absence of any attempt to direct the attention of the pupils to the meaning and significance of practical work and activities. The whole routine is concentrated on a species of scholasticism or pseudo-intellectualism. Indeed, those concerned with the conduct of secondary education emphasize the academic character of the secondary schools as distinguished from the practical character of other types of institutions. The result is that secondary education develops in the minds of the pupils a contempt and distaste for manual activities and finds no place in its scheme for a real appreciation of the meaning of modern social organization and problems. In fact, active opposition was shown in one country against the introduction of two textbooks that aimed successfully to develop a concrete and objective interest in the industrial and agricultural problems of the country. Such textbooks, it was feared, would displace the theoretical study of political economy.

The conception of secondary education finds its counterpart in the general popular view of secondary education as a method of release from industrial and commercial activities on which the future progress of these countries rests. The result is that the path of education is strewn with failures, some seventy per cent, that might well have been salvaged for the good of the countries concerned by other types of education. Industrial schools there are, technical schools are available, but they are attended by the lower classes. Undoubtedly society gains in the long run from the possession of highly educated leaders, but the danger that is ever present is that the selection of these leaders is costly and develops an intellectual caste.

The danger is all the more aggravated by the absence of methods and opportunities for the development of a sense of

coöperation, of an *esprit de corps*. Moral and civic instruction is largely theoretical and analytical. Sports and athletics are discouraged and there is serious danger that lack of such provision will lead to the development of professionalism and vicarious exercise. Athletics and other corporate activities would go far to develop ideals of coöperation and fair play, joy in the game and readiness to lose, ability to lead, and intelligence to follow.

Fundamentally the conception of culture on which these systems are based is static and unproductive. It separates too strictly knowledge as an accumulation of facts from knowledge as an instrument of individual progress. Culminating in examinations, it tends to emphasize memorization rather than application, and places ability to repeat what has been learned by rote above understanding. Further, the absence of differentiated material suited to various types of ability means lack of opportunities and consequent loss of talent for each country.

I realize the danger that I incur in thus criticizing the educational systems of other countries. It would be impertinent, indeed, for me, a foreigner, even after a year's study, to venture on any criticism. And yet I am fortified by what appear to me sound reasons. In the first place my standards are not theoretical standards. They are based on a comparative study of what is going on virtually throughout the world in the attempt to establish systems of education adapted to modern societies. I hold no brief for the system of any one country, but I am guided by almost universal tendencies. There can, of course, never be a single system of education universally applicable, and each country must inevitably express its own national genius in its own system; but with this reservation the considered tendencies of most European countries and of the United States point in a general direction. Secondly, I am encouraged to make these criticisms by what I read and see of the recent developments of your own system of secondary education. And, finally,

I am supported at every step by a volume of criticisms and plans for reform proposed in the four countries with which I am here dealing. For you in Mexico these criticisms are, I hope, illuminating, for they confirm your efforts and plans.

Professor Ernesto Nelson, who approaches the problems with a rich knowledge of European and American systems, thus discusses secondary education in the Argentine: "An institution for secondary education which succeeds in educating only the minority of the student body attending it is in itself an indication of serious defects which endanger the specific function for which it is intended. It will be claimed that the 3,600 out of 5,000 boys eliminated from the *colegios* will gain something from the passage through their halls, so that the instruction was not a complete failure. But the truth is that the rejected group is a group wholly lost from the point of view of culture. The *colegios* did not give them any useful knowledge of practical value, and at that gave only a culture that is preparatory to the university. . . . But in reality the state does not educate. The professor who tried to educate pupils in observation, judgment, comparison, etc., endeavoring in this way to make them free and independent beings, would be ruined as a professor, and would endanger the success of his pupils if they were not in a position at the time of the examinations to answer point by point those questions which are essential in the opinion of the examiners as individuals but which are not necessary for life or should be forgotten as quickly as possible."

Professor Juan Ramos, a distinguished jurist and educator, stated in 1926, "That the preparatory work is bad may be seen from the university entrance examinations and from the annual statistics of failures in the two faculties that have most students. That it is not cultural is an elementary truth acknowledged by every professor and by anybody who reads the extensive course of study into which has been thrown in good faith everything that could be included in the encyclopedic pretensions of its authors."

A former Minister of Public Instruction, Sr. Carlos Saavedra Lamas, noted the following defects in the secondary school system: An absence of integration between the different subjects; too much studying for examinations and failure to recognize the value of what was learned; lack of training in the application of knowledge; and an absence of moral and aesthetic training. Accordingly, he reformed the system by introducing a three-year general and exploratory secondary school leading up to a variety of vocational and senior secondary schools offering considerable scope for electives. The reform failed but the idea underlying it is still effective.

In the case of Brazil, Dr. Afranio Peixotto writes: "Secondary education, intended to give that general training indispensable for all who are going to live an active social life or to enter some specialized calling, should have a modern content consisting of modern languages, natural and social sciences, ancient and modern literature, fine arts, and healthful exercises that prepare for the more difficult acquisitions of culture as a whole. The stimulus for acquiring knowledge will not be an inquisitorial torture, which up to now has had a negative effect on education, but beauty itself, curiosity, interest, and the value of the subjects."

Another authority, Dr. Carneiro Leão, former Director of Education in the Federal District, says: "Two problems must be solved at once—those of organization and of method. Through the first reform an effort will be made to select and distribute the subjects, looking to the development of the spirit of our pupils rather than to entrance to the university, and remembering that our youth is Brazilian, and American, living in their own age and for their civilization. In the second solution the methods of instruction cannot be neglected with the aim of reducing the effort of the pupil and making all his studies interesting and practical. . . . It is essential to free our courses of study from verbalism and pure theory."

The system of secondary education in Chile has long been under criticism. Thus Encina in his *Nuestra Inferioridad*

Economica attributes the lack of his country's industrial and commercial progress to the secondary schools. "Education," he says, "does not develop in the young the desire and the steadfast will not to allow themselves to be overcome, nor are they filled with the ideal of industrial energy, the basis of power and greatness of people at the present time. Our young men lack that intense and unbounded ambition which inspires men to devote their lives to exhaustive activity in which the individual may be destroyed, but by which society is advanced."

Another critic, Luis Galdames, urges a closer relationship between general education and the economic life of the country and that more emphasis be placed on education rather than on imparting of subject matter. More recently the Asociación de Educación Nacional has urged a simplification of courses of study and their adaptation to the needs of the country; intensification of civic education; introduction of active methods; and closer articulation between the courses in the elementary, secondary, and special schools. The first step in the direction of reform was the establishment of a new system of administration in which the organization and administration of secondary education were removed from control of the University. The reform has been declared unconstitutional but its tendency is interesting.

Uruguay presents the same conflict between the conception of secondary education as a preparation for life and as a preparation for entrance to the university. Criticizing the tendency of regarding the *liceos* as preparatory schools Dr. Lapeyre states that "they have a far greater mission to perform, namely, to diffuse general culture and to prepare the man and the citizen for the exercise and development of his activities." Dr. Juan Monteverde follows the same line of thought in his statement that "the secondary schools of American countries must devote themselves to the primary aim of preparing citizens trained for the practice of democracy and sufficiently educated to contribute to the progress

of the society in which they live; the training of students to master higher studies must be regarded as subsidiary to secondary education."

Such, then, are the criticisms and tendencies in the field of secondary education of the countries under discussion. If you have followed me thus far, you will appreciate one of my reasons for availing myself of the opportunity of studying the reforms recently inaugurated in Mexico. It is because Mexico is to my knowledge the first of the Latin-American countries that has faced the situation squarely and, while not ignoring completely the claims of tradition, has attempted to meet the claims of the large body of the population that is not destined to enter the liberal professions. Mexico is now at the stage when she can well furnish a lead to her Latin-American sisters. As I proceed with a consideration of practices and tendencies, you will, I hope, be able to see that what you are doing has the support of theory and practice both in Europe and in the United States.

It will be clear that out of the analysis of the secondary school systems of the South American countries that I have presented there emerge a number of questions of general significance and application.

1. How many pupils successfully complete the secondary course? What advantage have those received who have failed?
2. Can any nation afford to maintain a system in which only ten per cent of the pupils succeed to the end?
3. What is culture or liberal education?
4. How can an educated élite be secured?
5. What is the significance of educational psychology and the psychology of adolescence for the organization of secondary education?
6. Does the traditional type of secondary education prepare to meet the problems of modern social development, the needs of modern progress, the requirements of democracy itself?

II

Education for Intellectual Selection and for National Culture

In my last lecture I dealt with a type of secondary education whose primary aim was selection. But while all education as it advances is inevitably selective and distributive, a system that has selection alone for its objective and that bases this selection on examinations only is in danger of sacrificing the majority in favor of the minority. The chief danger that such a system faces, however, is that both the individual and the value of the subjects themselves lose their significance in favor of the examinations, and those who are successful owe their success too frequently to patience, persistence, and a good memory rather than to intellectual ability. From the point of view of mere selection one subject is as good as any other, and one topic may have as much value as another whether it has real significance for life or not. Today I propose to deal with types of secondary education for intellectual selection and for national culture. For these types I have selected the French and German systems as illustrations.

France, of all countries of the world, has learned the secret of remaining faithful to her past and of adapting herself slowly and gradually to changing conditions. And this secret she has sought to apply to her educational system. The strength and greatness of French secondary education have always lain in the sincere devotion to the classical tradition—the humanities in the best and broadest sense. And it is because of this devotion that France has attempted, in the introduction of every innovation, to approximate to this tradition. Thus, although modern languages were added and then later sciences, the traditional ideal was not forgotten.

And yet there has always been considerable unrest, so that changes take place periodically. Today France is in a stage

of transition much more marked than at the close of the nineteenth century. Before proceeding to a consideration of the causes of this unrest and the problems involved, it would be advisable to trace briefly the development of the French system of secondary education since 1902. The reform of 1902 turned mainly on the question of the equivalent value of classical and modern languages and only partially on an attempt to meet differences of individual abilities. The system then introduced provided for a course of seven years divided into two cycles of four and three years respectively. The first cycle permitted a choice of two sections, one with Latin and the other with modern languages and science. At the close of the first cycle the student had a choice of four courses—classical, Latin-modern languages, Latin-sciences, modern languages-sciences—for two years, followed by a choice of philosophy or mathematics for the final year.

Criticisms began to be heard early. It was thought by some that the absence of emphasis on the purely classical tradition was beginning to affect the quality of French literary style and language, that the training of modern languages emphasized too much the spoken mastery of language rather than foreign cultures and the contributions of other nations to civilization, and finally that not all students were receiving the same foundation in sciences. In general, it was also charged that only the students of poorer ability chose the non-Latin courses, but in my opinion with little justification.

Immediately after the War the task of reform was undertaken, and in 1921 M. Léon Bérard, as Minister of Public Instruction, began his campaign for a reform entirely on a classical foundation. For the first four years all pupils in the *lycées* and *collèges*, that is, boys, were to have but one course involving four years of Latin and two years of Greek. This was to be followed by a choice from three courses—classical, Latin-modern languages, and modern languages-

sciences—and no student was to be admitted to these courses without a certificate of classical studies. The reform was introduced by decree in 1923 in the face of considerable professional and popular opposition. Before it could go into effect in October, 1924, the government had changed and the new Minister of Public Instruction restored the modern language course in the first four years.

The Bérard attempt at reform is interesting for our present consideration from a number of points of view. It indicates that any attempt in modern days to confine secondary education is likely everywhere to meet with failure, and that modern secondary education must give attention to individual needs and capacities. M. Bérard, although charged with being reactionary and with endeavoring to impose an aristocratic system of selection on France, was undoubtedly sincere. He had merely misjudged the tendencies of the day.

Among these tendencies the most important is the democratic and national movement for an educational system that will avoid class distinctions, that will provide various avenues for different abilities, and that will promote the highest welfare of the country through a variety of channels. This movement, sponsored by a group of young Frenchmen who organized themselves during the War as *Les Compagnons de l'Université Nouvelle*, has been one of the strongest influences in the present development of French education.

Already the discussions centering round the Bérard reform have had their effect. In order to make the classical and modern language courses as nearly alike in value as possible, the emphasis in both is to be on humanities and culture inherent in the languages studied. The aim is not so much to develop specialists either in the classics or in the modern languages as to produce through different media cultured Frenchmen. Further, in order to avoid too great differentiation between the various groups the programs in mathematics and science, in history and geography, and especially in French are almost identical. Again, in order

to make the system as democratic as possible, the same foundation is provided for all in a common primary education, scholarships have been established, and access is afforded to the *lycées* and *collèges* for the late arrivals, pupils who develop late or who receive the first four years of their education in a higher primary school.

What are the characteristic qualities of French secondary education? Perhaps the most striking is the definite objective, which is truly national—ability to speak well and ability to write well (*bien dire et bien écrire*). But underlying this objective is the esteem for writing and speaking well not for their own sake but as an indication of ability to think well. Further, ability to think well implies also command of information not for its own sake but for use. Knowledge *qua* knowledge is not put on a pedestal; its utilitarian value is recognized and that despite the fact that the secondary schools are said to devote themselves to *études désinteressées*.

Thus far it must already have struck you that no mention has been made of the universities or their requirements. Indeed, secondary education is looked upon as an independent unit. It is true that the *baccalauréat*, which represents the culmination of secondary education, is required for entrance to the universities, but the universities do not dictate what shall be taught.

The purpose of French secondary education so discussed is definitely to select "the élite of the nation. Its aim," according to M. Paul Appell, "is to train in reflection rather than to fill the mind." An excellent summary of the aims was presented by M. Bergson: "We wish to form a man with an open mind, capable of developing in more than one direction. We want him to be equipped with knowledge that is indispensable and able to add to his store other knowledge that he has been trained to acquire. . . . We must press as far as possible the productive power of the country. We must build up the greatest possible sum of

knowledge in pure science and disinterested research. We must finally and above all maintain the French genius and strengthen all that there is of light within it to insure for it the brightest radiance throughout the world."

The preparation of an intellectual élite and the development of a national culture are then the obvious objectives of this type of secondary education. But, as was hinted above, there is considerable unrest. There are many who feel that the objectives are attained at too high a price; that too many students, some seventy-five per cent, fail to meet the standards, and that cramming (*bachotage*) is too often the result. At the same time France has in her teaching corps scholars of the highest eminence selected by the examination for the *agregation*, and some of the teaching methods, as, for instance, the *explication des textes*, are well calculated to make pupils think, if they have the wherewithal for this process. And yet there is dissatisfaction. The principle of selection of an élite is accepted, but the basis is too narrow. France needs an élite not merely in the intellectual field but in all other activities of life. Hence the problem is beginning to be viewed from a new point of view: What is the proper kind of secondary education and what is its relation to a democratic society? An élite is desirable but so, too, is the recognition of individual needs and capacities.

France recognizes in general, first, that an educational system must provide variety of opportunities; secondly, that such variety of opportunities is important for national progress; and thirdly, that running through a differentiated system of education there must be a strain of common culture, of national ideals. Accordingly there is now a movement in France to place all types of schools under the one Ministry of Public Instruction in order to secure articulation and community of purposes; to some extent this movement has already been realized. The ideal organization that is being sought is that proposed by Anatole France (*La Vie*

en Fleur). "The same education for all, rich and poor. All will attend the primary school. Those among them who will show the highest aptitude will be allowed to receive a secondary education, which, without fees, will unite on the same benches the élite of the bourgeois youth and the élite of the proletarian youth. And from this élite will proceed an élite to the higher schools of science and art. Thus will democracy be administered by the best."

But what is secondary education? That is the question suggested by Anatole France. So far the *école unique* has been realized to the extent that all—rich and poor—have the same primary education up to the age of eleven or twelve. The new movement beyond this is to consider all education beyond the primary as secondary—a tremendous forward step by which secondary education will no longer include only *lycées* and *collèges*, but the higher primary and technical schools, all built upon the same foundation and each articulated with the other. And the basis for this change is not merely democratic but has its use in a new approach to the whole problem which is well summarized in a Parliamentary report of 1924: "We ought not to admit a distinction commonly made between the *culture désinteressée* of the secondary institutions and the *culture utilitaire* of the higher primary school. For neither can the education of the *lycées* and *collèges* be wholly disinterested nor should that of the higher primary schools ignore this method of developing the mind which trains it for the pure exercise and love of intelligence. The best means that we have of raising the popular classes is to give them a taste for ideas and to introduce them to the noble emotions of art." Any other conception would lead to the development of an intellectual caste, besides involving the danger of "directing attention too exclusively to liberal or aesthetic careers, to administrative positions and not to commerce and industry."

Largely as a result of her financial situation France has not yet put these ideas into effect. Today there are a

number of institutions in which is conducted the work of the *lycée* and *collège*, of the *école primaire supérieure*, and of the *école technique*. Wherever possible common subjects are taught by the same teacher in the three departments, thus breaking down centuries of tradition. The importance of this cannot be realized unless it is considered from the point of view of individual needs. This organization makes educational guidance possible and brings to the individual the opportunity of continuing his education if he shows ability. In any case all partake from the same rich stock of national culture and the élite emerges naturally. Before leaving France may I point out that these tendencies are only in their initial stage? The ideal has been beautifully expressed by M. Léon Brunschvieg: "It is important that all the children of France should be considered alike as living plants, whose spontaneous growth will be assured by the same methods; only the trunk will be allowed to grow up to a certain height before the branches are permitted to shoot out but without opposing any artificial obstacle to the expansion of the being whose innate powers will raise it up to the level designed for it."

France is thus moving in the direction of a wide differentiation of secondary education which will bind the various classes of society into a national whole by participation, as far as possible, in a common culture. If a criticism may be offered it would be this, that French thought in education is still too overwhelmingly intellectualistic and adequate attention has not yet been devoted to the educative possibilities of corporate activities in the schools, social organizations, sports, and athletics.

The development of education in Germany since the adoption of a democratic form of government represents a compromise between demands for radical reforms and the claims of tradition. On the one hand there was the pressing demand for a complete reorganization of the educational system on the basis of the *Einheitsschule*, a common foundation until

the age of twelve and differentiation thereafter. This proposal failed on the other hand partly for financial reasons, partly on account of vested interests in the university and secondary fields. One important installment in response to the movement for a common school has, however, been made. A common foundation of about four years has been established and poor pupils of ability are given encouragement by means of scholarships to continue their education.

But if the external reform of the framework of the system has not proceeded very far, the internal reform of the spirit underlying education has been remarkable.

So far as the provision of secondary education is concerned the chief change has consisted of the establishment of two new types of schools—the *Deutsche Oberschule* and the *Aufbauschule*. The result is that after the completion of four years of elementary education the German boy has a choice of the following types of courses:

1. Classical in the *Gymnasium*.
2. Semi-classical in the *Realgymnasium*.
3. Mathematical-scientific in the *Oberrealschule*.
4. German-cultural in the *Deutsche Oberschule*.
5. Certain combinations of these.

All of these courses are nine years in length, but there is a convenient break at the end of the sixth year and most pupils leave at that stage. The *Aufbauschule* will be considered later.

The reforms that have taken place have been inspired by a number of factors. The Germans have discovered that while their secondary schools developed careful, persevering scholarship, the result in general consisted of the mere amassing of facts and information, of an absence of critical judgment, of an emphasis on instruction rather than on education. The programs and courses of study were encyclopedic and burdensome. Finally, secondary education as a whole and the special courses individually failed to attain and promote a national end.

These criticisms from within the secondary school coincided with a broader, national movement for the *Einheitsschule*. While the actual organization of a system on this basis failed, the movement resulted in the recognition of two factors: the need of increasing the opportunities for secondary education, and the desirability of emphasizing a common national culture. Opportunities have been increased within the present economic conditions of the country by scholarships and reduction of fees. Further, the *Mittelschule*, corresponding to the French *école primaire supérieure*, has in certain respects been approximated to the first six years of the secondary school. Finally, a serious gap has been filled in providing a new type of secondary schools, the *Aufbauschule*, for those who continue in the elementary school until the age of thirteen and show ability. The *Aufbauschule*, which is usually located in smaller towns and rural areas, offers a six-year course with emphasis on German culture and leads its graduates up to the university.

But the chief change has been one in spirit. The aim is no longer the production of narrow specialists in classics, or in modern languages, or in mathematics and sciences, but, building on the work of the elementary schools, to emphasize these various approaches to civilization in their significance for German national culture. I hope that it will be clear that a distinction is made between national and nationalistic culture. The secondary schools aim to emphasize the various forces that have made German culture today and to point out its present significance. While the approach is thus historical, it does not stop at this point but aims, as the old education failed to do, to develop an appreciation of Germany's present problems. Since the elementary schools at their level, with their emphasis on *Heimatkunde* and *Lebenskunde*, are attempting the same task, it is hoped that the old sharp distinction between the intellectual classes and the masses will be avoided. In other words, the integrating value of education is recognized.

The relation of secondary education to higher education has remained unchanged. The only requirements still imposed by the university are that candidates for entrance must be graduates of a nine-year school and must have studied at least two foreign languages. Beyond this students who do not meet the requirements of special faculties may make up their deficiencies in the universities themselves. Secondary education in Germany, as in France, is thus free from university control.

Of equal interest with the attempt to integrate national education by means of a common strain of culture running through all types of schools is the attempt to integrate various subjects in the curriculum for the sake of the individual. Hitherto subjects were increased in number and placed side by side without any connection with each other whatever. Under the new system subjects are to be taught in as close relation to each other as possible, and the significance of one subject for any other is to be brought out. Thus the program in Latin will attempt to teach not only Latin but the significance of every aspect of Roman civilization and culture for subsequent developments, especially in Germany.

It at once becomes obvious that such a plan must have important consequences both for administration and for the teaching profession. From the point of view of administration a fixed detailed program of studies is out of the question. Hence, instead of issuing detailed regulations, most of the German states now publish Suggestions (*Richtlinien*) and the detailed courses are made up by the teaching staff. The effect on the teaching profession is that narrow specialism is out of the question and each teacher must appreciate the significance of his own subject for the whole educational process. Thus the course of study in any subject is first drawn up by the specialists and then submitted to the whole faculty for suggestions for integration. In this way the faculty of a school no longer consists of a number of specialists but of what the Germans call an *Arbeitsgemeinschaft* or co-

operative working group. This principle of the coöperative working group may be extended to secure coöperation not merely between a number of schools of the same level but also between secondary and elementary school teachers. In general, the new principle means a breakdown between various subjects; it implies vigor, flexibility, and above all attention to the fundamental purpose of the school, which is not primarily to teach subjects but to use subjects for educative purposes.

An approach of this kind necessarily involves a new orientation in methods of instruction. One of the chief criticisms of the old German school was its overemphasis on books and on memorization. Today German education, whether elementary or secondary, is founded on the principle of activity (*Arbeit*). Knowledge is not discarded, but the development of judgment, imagination, and will is regarded as the ultimate and essential objective. Hence the actual hours of instruction have been curtailed and the emphasis in the classroom is not on reproducing but on methods of acquiring knowledge, not on absorption but on active ability to attack problems. Hence, too, the emphasis in the classroom on the coöperative working group. The responsibility is thus placed on the teacher to create situations and on the pupil to master them. Beyond this and as the pupils become older several hours a week are allotted in the time-table for the organization of free activity groups, that is, groups interested in more intensive study of some existing subject or in entering on a new subject.

Another phase of the recent development of German secondary education is the new place assigned to music and art and the cultivation of appreciation in these fields. Perhaps the most significant change, the more striking to those who are familiar with the atmosphere of all work and no play that used to prevail in the German schools, is the attention and sanction given to sports and athletics, to excursions and student societies. Exaggerated at first and with political tend-

encies during the period of general upheaval, the student activities have settled down to the organization of those corporate interests that are proper for adolescents. The new spirit was incorporated in a decree of 1922: "If the school itself by establishing and promoting pupil organizations gives sympathetic attention to the youthful need for free, self-determined coöperation, if it develops all its life activities in the spirit of genuine coöperation in life and work, organizes class and school communities in the sense of true comradeship, if education and instruction are permeated with civic ideals, a more than equivalent substitute will be found for many formal requirements. The school will insure the effectiveness of its work most successfully if the teachers take greater pains than ever before to meet the pupils sympathetically instead of applying to them adult standards which are often strange to them."

Still one other innovation remains to be mentioned. In the old system parents were virtually excluded from the school. The new system seeks to establish a relationship between the school and the home by the creation of parents' councils in order to develop an atmosphere of confidence and an appreciation of the new aims of the school. The school thus assumes to educate not only the new but the old generation as well, an essential step in the development of new lines of reform.

What the results will be it is too early to state. It may be that steps will have to be retraced. Germany may discover that she makes her selection at too early an age and that specialization may well be postponed in favor of a more prolonged common foundation, as in France, England, and the United States. But the truly educational spirit in which the problem is being approached can best be seen in the new methods of testing the results of the new system. No longer is the emphasis on the reproduction of facts and information; instead, the examining board of the school investigates a candidate's record throughout his school career from every

possible angle—intellectual and moral, and then the test consists in permitting the candidate to show his ability to investigate a problem, often one of his own selection. Ultimately this is after all the real test of education—ability to work independently, mastery of tools, appreciation, discrimination, and judgment.

I have endeavored in this presentation to show how the French and German ideals, though starting from different points of approach, approximate each other. Both aim by different means to promote national culture; the French conception is somewhat absolutistic in character with a leaning to *belles lettres* and the aesthetic in general; the German is perhaps more practical, more directed to produce the development of an appreciation of present problems through the historical approach. Both aim to develop judgment, taste, and discrimination on the part of the individual. But here the points of similarity stop. There is a wide difference between the two countries in the methods of instruction. The French teacher is essentially a scholar, interested in his subject, and his method too often represents the logical approach. The German teacher may not be as profound a scholar as the French, but with the more intensive professional training that he enjoys and with the new approach, his attention is more closely devoted to the individual as an individual, and his methods tend to be based on principles of development that are psychologically more sound. In both countries we have been dealing with tendencies not yet completely realized; in both secondary education aims to serve the ends of selection of an intellectual élite and to develop national culture. Whether the basis of these aims is sufficiently broad there is doubt in both countries. In my subsequent discussions I plan to consider proposals and practices that attempt to deal with this problem.

III

Education and Character-Formation

The systems of secondary education in France and Germany, as I endeavored to point out in my last lecture, are permeated by two aims, the selection of an élite and the development of national culture. The English system of secondary education can less easily be characterized. In the first place England is not a country given to systematization, and secondly, secondary education has, hitherto, not been given in one but in a variety of types of schools. Many of these, like the so-called public schools, have an ancient history and though called "public" are really private foundations; many are private schools; others, which have sprung up within the last twenty-five years are maintained by the local authorities for education; finally, a number of schools of all types are inspected and assisted financially by the national Board of Education.

There is thus no well-defined system of secondary education as in France and Germany. Nor is there any clearly defined aim of secondary education. The official definition of secondary education is that it is that education which is suitable for pupils between the ages of twelve and eighteen. Generally it is understood that a secondary school curriculum includes two foreign languages, English, science and mathematics, history and geography, drawing, music, manual work, and physical exercises. The Board of Education does not lay down any fixed programs of study, but offers suggestions and advice based on the general practices of the country as a whole. The schools thus enjoy considerable freedom, tempered by responsibility, in the matter of curricula, courses of study, and methods of instruction. While the schools are thus free and each is able to develop a character of its own, schools that receive assistance from the government are subject to inspection.

And yet, running through the whole system, there is a

marked and distinct standard. This is not set up by the national Board of Education but is subject to its approval. A number of examining boards have been established by individual universities or by groups of universities, but the examinations are not conducted primarily with the needs of higher education in mind but rather for the purpose of setting up for pupils of secondary school age standards of attainment in what is usually accepted to be a general liberal education. The requirements of the examinations are so flexible that as a rule the question of domination by them does not arise. Examinations are conducted twice in the secondary school course of some six years—the first at the end of the first four years, which are devoted to general education, the second at the end of the last two years in which pupils may to some extent begin to specialize in some fields of liberal studies. In view of the absence of widespread professional training, the examinations serve to set up general standards of attainments.

But it would be untrue to conclude that either the universities or the examinations dominate. Standards in separate subjects are also framed by the suggestions and programs of the many societies of subject specialists, such as the Classical Association, the Historical Association, the Modern Language Society, the English Association. Special inquiries conducted by the Government have also contributed largely to the improvement of the organization of special subjects.

It will be obvious that as compared with France and Germany, England does not possess any fixed theory or conception of what constitutes a liberal education. Dominated almost to the close of the nineteenth century by the classical tradition, the doors of the secondary school were opened at first grudgingly and then more widely to modern languages and sciences. None the less it was not until within the last ten years or so that any attempt was made to avoid early specialization and to develop balanced curricula. Nor does the other aspect of German and French education pre-

dominate, that is, the deliberate effort to select an élite. Pupils who have the ability are encouraged to advance, but the main effort of the schools is to leave the mark of the educative process in its broadest sense on all pupils. England emphasizes neither intellectual attainments as does Germany, nor the obtaining of diplomas and certificates as does France. Her aim is to train men and women.

Any layman, any teacher, if asked offhand what the purpose of education is would answer at once that it is the formation of character, the moral and social training of the individual. And it is this training that is the most marked characteristic of English education. Here again England does not possess any formula or definition or theory of character or character-formation. From the point of view of organization the provision for character-formation, unlike the extra-curricular activities in the United States, is unobtrusive. Moral instruction as such, special courses in civics and citizenship, are but rarely found, and yet the ideals that are sought by such instruction are inculcated. So far as direct relations between teachers and pupils in the classroom are concerned opportunities for training in conduct are seized as they arise. But the greatest effectiveness in the formation of character is attained outside the classroom. Originating in the boarding schools, in which opportunities had to be provided for some outlet for youthful energies, the fundamental principle that emerged was that the best method for the formation of character consisted in the development of a community spirit, a feeling of corporate life, an *esprit de corps*. This meant in time that the school stands for something more than mere instruction, that it has customs, standards, and traditions that must be lived up to. In other words, the school is not a collection of classrooms, a loose organization of teachers and pupils, but a living organism, a society in miniature which imposes standards of living and of conduct that reflect the standards of the society around it. In this social community the teachers play their part, but unobtrusively

and in the background. They are ready to advise, to cooperate, to play their part, to encourage and to stimulate, but leadership and direction is entrusted to the pupils. Wherein, then, lies the control?—not in the authority of the teachers, not in rigor of discipline, but in a personal sense of fitness, of *noblesse oblige*. The standards that govern are moral standards. "It simply is not done" settles any conflict forever.

Now, what are these standards?—in replica those standards that make for the smooth running of any society. Honesty, uprightness, unselfishness, coöperation, give and take, fair play, playing the game are some of the ideals that are cultivated. But the system, a word that is in this connection most inappropriate, aims to do more; it provides opportunities for the emergence of leaders and for the exercise of initiative; it develops ability to see the other man's point of view; it trains in tenacity of purpose that is often unreasoning, but a tenacity based on the feeling that a task undertaken must be finished, whether for the group, for the school, or for the community.

Such are the ideals that are held to constitute the ends of character training. The means are those that any healthy-minded group of adolescent boys or girls would adopt. Athletics, games, sports loom large in the schools, but so do they in national life. Every pupil has an opportunity of engaging in some activity to which he may be inclined. But athletics do not constitute the only outlet; any form of adolescent activity that is of social value has its devotees—debating societies, literary societies, scientific societies, stamp collectors, natural history societies, photographic clubs, chess clubs, music clubs, and many others. Running throughout these activities is the system of self-government in which, except in the gravest instances, discipline is to a large extent entrusted to the older pupils, a practice which not only trains in qualities of leadership but inculcates a rule often forgotten, that ideals of obedience are of equal importance with ability to lead.

Developed first in the "public schools," the ideals and traditions were gradually transferred, so far as they could be transferred to the larger boarding schools and then to other day secondary schools, and today there is every reason to believe that they are serving as an inspiration to the elementary schools. I realize that there are dangers in the practice and that the "public schools" have recently been subjected to criticism, but aberrations do not affect the general principle. From the point of view of the present discussion I only seek to indicate that while France attempts to develop a national attitude through *études désinteressées* and Germany through the cultivation of a common culture, the bond that binds the English nation together lies in the conception of character that I have endeavored to analyze and the methods for its formation and development. Intellectual training thus assumes a secondary place; often it is subjected to healthy contempt; and yet it is there for those who want it.

And this brings me to the point at which unrest in English education begins. A serious criticism that has recently been levelled against secondary education in England is that it is not adequately articulated with elementary education, that except for a small number of able pupils who by means of free tuition or scholarships advance from the elementary to the secondary school, a large number of pupils who might profit from secondary education are deprived of opportunities of access, while many already in the secondary schools waste their time from the point of view of intellectual training or achievement. Taking the latter point first a direct attack has been made on the problem from two angles. First, the Board of Education has urged that pupils be required to continue in the secondary school for a minimum period of four years; in other words, in the opinion of the authorities a partial exposure to secondary education is valueless for the individual and uneconomical for the nation.

A more scientific attack on the problem was made by the director of secondary education of one of the local authorities.

He directed his investigations to the examinations and found that of the pupils ready for the first examination at about the age of sixteen and after four years of secondary school only about thirty per cent succeeded in passing. Further, a statistical analysis showed that only about twenty per cent of the students continued their education beyond the secondary school. His conclusion was significant: "It seems likely that for at least one third of the pupils some variation of the curriculum should have been provided, and that they should have been offered something better than a hopeless struggle towards a goal they were not destined to reach. . . . The period from eleven to fourteen in the secondary school should be regarded primarily as a testing period, and at about fourteen there should be offered to pupils who are not what might be called the academic type some variation of curriculum." As a result of this investigation a number of courses of a technical and practical character—engineering, handicraft, textiles, agriculture, and so on—have been introduced into the secondary schools of this area.

Clearly a new stage has been reached in England in the conception of the function of secondary education in national development and nowhere has this been so clearly and so well expressed as in a speech recently delivered by the Minister of Education: "It was of the utmost importance that they should realize that secondary education at this moment was, in a sense, in a state of transition, that our grammar schools and other secondary schools had now to discharge functions rather different from those they had hitherto discharged and which a good many people still expected them to discharge. . . . He believed that in the next few years industry and commerce were going to demand more and more boys from the grammar schools, and that it was intensely important that we should develop the structure of secondary education to meet that demand."

The distance that we have now moved is clear. We began with a somewhat fixed, formal curriculum leading up to

examinations and resulting in a large number of failures through systems offering differentiated but academic courses founded in the conception of general or natural culture for the élite, to a system in which the results of such a type of academic training are being investigated and found wanting. The stage that we have reached up to this point in England is represented by a demand, not for the elimination of general liberal education, but for the introduction of further differentiation in the interests of industry and commerce, or in other words to supplement general cultural with some practical training. The traditional national aim of character-formation is to be supplemented with an education that is pointed in the direction of individual capacities and national needs. This change has been due also in large measure to the fact that since 1914 the enrollment in secondary schools has nearly doubled. Such an increase in the student body inevitably brings with it a revision of the traditional conception of the function of secondary education and to some extent a review of the meaning of liberal education.

Up to this point I have considered only the changes that have taken place in the traditional secondary school. The movement that has been going on here has come into contact with another movement which began before the War but has been hastened by it. It is a movement exactly similar in tendency to that known in Germany as the *Einheitsschule* and in France as the *école unique*, the common school movement. It represents a desire to knit the whole educational fabric of England into a national system, to increase educational opportunities, and to meet the needs of individual capacities and of social and national progress. It is a movement for democracy in education. This movement cannot be appreciated without some understanding of the historical development of English education. As I have indicated earlier, England has not had a national, logically organized system of education. Rather, there has been a conglomeration of educational facilities. Thus elementary education

developed by itself and consisted of schools established privately or by various groups, mainly religious, supplemented since 1870 by public schools and united into something like a national organization since 1902. Secondary education developed through private effort and was not articulated with elementary education. It was not until after 1902 that secondary education began to be established and maintained at public expense and even then overlapping between elementary and secondary education continued. Technical and commercial education in the same way had their own development, apart from the other branches.

Since about 1914 a movement has been begun to unite these various educational facilities into a national whole, retaining, however, the national characteristics of variety and flexibility and leaving room for the interplay of public and private effort, and for freedom and responsibility in local administration. This movement sponsored first by the Labor Party, under the plea of *Secondary Schools for All*, has been adopted by all political parties. Essentially the movement is one for the provision of opportunities for education suited to a democracy. Technically it is based on the recognition that the period known as adolescence brings with it changes of interests to which the schools must cater. Practically it arises out of the recognition of a fact noticeable in other countries besides England, that the last two years of the elementary schools, that is, the education of boys and girls between eleven and fourteen or thereabouts, is largely wasted through much repetition and lack of suitable curricular adaptation. The best pupils generally have been advanced between the ages of eleven and twelve to the secondary schools. The new program in educational politics seeks to provide something adequate for the rest.

Hence it is generally recognized that for the majority of normal boys and girls the period round the age of twelve should form a definite line of demarcation, that at this period should be completed the type of education hitherto known as

elementary, and that differentiation should then begin. The proposal thus involves a change in terminology that will at once be intelligible and will imply the elimination of overlapping. The first part of the educational system, that in which the main efforts are devoted to imparting the fundamental tools of education as well as appropriate character building, is to be known as primary, and everything that follows that part is to be known as secondary. Notice what that means, for something of the same kind has been going on in Mexico. It means that the traditional, almost sacred, conception of the term secondary education as a type of general education and in some cases of education preparatory to the university, is torn from its foundations and replaced by a conception in which secondary education becomes virtually synonymous with the education of the adolescent. In fact, a special committee appointed to consider the whole subject issued its report under this title, *The Education of the Adolescent*, a report which will mark an epoch in English education.

And yet the movement is not confined to England; it has its parallel in France in the tendency to group the *lycées* and *collèges*, the *écoles primaires supérieures*, and the *écoles techniques* together as a unit; it is analogous to the changes in the United States involved in the reorganization of the system into primary, junior high school, and senior high school; it is similar to the proposals of Sr. Saavedra Lamas in Argentina; and you have the beginnings of the movement in your own country. From the point of view of organization and administration the development is almost natural and logical. What is startling in it is the inevitable shock to our prepossessions about the meaning of secondary education.

England is not planning to follow the practice of the United States of attempting to meet the needs of all adolescents in a single school. Rather does the plan involve the establishment of a variety of types offering differentiated opportunities according to the varied needs of individuals, the require-

ments of the localities, and the demands of society as a whole. But in order to preserve the national and democratic character of the schools and to avoid a development into watertight compartments, the schools are to be closely articulated and pupils may transfer from one type to another until they find the type best suited to their capacities.

One important administrative change accompanies the recommendations of the committee on the *Education of the Adolescent* and that is the extension of the compulsory age of attendance up to fifteen. This proposal is due partly to the temporary fact of juvenile unemployment, but more to the recognition that a rounded education of the type to be considered can best be given in a period of four years. At present there is a strong agitation in Parliament to extend the compulsory age limit to fifteen, but financial reasons and the need of time to establish and organize the new types of schools are arguments against such an immediate step. But it is characteristic of the flexibility of English educational administration that progress is never by revolution, that every new step has the sanction of voluntary experiment. The new types of schools that are proposed have already been established for nearly fifteen years by a number of local authorities, such as London, Manchester, Liverpool, Bradford, Leeds, but on a voluntary basis and without incorporation into the system of secondary education. Further, under the Act of 1918 local authorities may obtain permission from the Board of Education to extend the compulsory age limit to fifteen. A number of authorities have already obtained such permission and before a national law is passed England will already have had the benefit of experiments in different parts of the country.[1]

From the point of view of the discussions that I have undertaken here, the expansion of the notion of secondary education, what will be attempted in the new schools is of greater interest than questions of organization. The new schools

[1] See note on page 127.

will offer courses of three or four years following on primary education, directed to the development of mental power. The general aims proposed are the forming and strengthening of character; the training of the tastes which fill and dignify leisure; the awakening and guiding of the intelligence, especially on its practical side. Two methods will differentiate these schools from the academic secondary schools. One will be the method of practical instruction and manual work, since there are many pupils who think with their hands, as it were, and will profit greatly by a method of instruction which follows the natural bent of their capacity. Another will be the method of giving a realistic character to the general course of studies. English and a modern language, history and geography, mathematics and natural science, will all be studied in these schools no less than in the secondary schools proper. "But the study of these subjects will be related more closely to the living texture of industrial or commercial or rural life; and it will be designed to stimulate interest in boys and girls who are beginning to think of the coming years and a career in life, and are likely to feel the liveliest quickening of the mind when they see the bearing of their studies on that career." Thus the pupils will be offered the stimulus of practical and realistic studies combined with a general and humane education, "which, if it remembers handwork, does not forget music, and, if it cherishes natural science, fosters also linguistic and literary studies."

The theory and principles underlying these proposals are of interest, I believe, to you in your reform of secondary education. Three great ends of human life and activity are to be promoted. "One is the forming and strengthening of character—individual and national character—through the placing of youth, in the hour of its growth, . . . in a congenial and inspiring environment. Another is the training of boys and girls to delight in pursuits and rejoice in accomplishments—work in music and art; work in wood and in metals; work in literature and the record of human history, which

may become the recreations and the ornaments of leisure in maturer years. And still another is the awakening and guiding of the practical intelligence, for the better and more skilled service of the community in all its multiple business and complex affairs, an end which cannot be dismissed as *utilitarian* in any country, and least of all in a country like England, so highly industrialized, and so dependent on the success of its industries, that it needs for its success, and even for its safety, the best and most highly trained skill of its citizens."

In terms of social and national development, what does this tendency manifested in the English movement mean? It means fundamentally a break with the traditional conception of one education for the class from which the potential élite was to be drawn and of another education for the masses. It means the organization of educational opportunities for the great majority "whose character and intelligence will determine the quality of national life" in the near future. It does not exclude, and the new philosophy of secondary education in general does not exclude, the necessity of an appropriate education for the more gifted, for experts, for leaders in all walks of life. It merely expands the basis of selection to which all countries have hitherto been addicted.

Our failure in times past has been the failure to recognize that the cult of the humanities, of liberal education, of academic education in general takes into account only one aspect of individual capacity and of national life. "School and industry are different facets of a single society, and the habit of mind which isolates them from each other is a habit to be overcome. Education fails in part of its aim, if it does not prepare children for a life of active labor and of social cooperation; industry fails no less, if it does not use and strengthen the qualities of mind and character which have been cultivated by education."

This brings me to a general summary of the present English movement in secondary education which, if not actually

realized, represents a tendency which is to be the basis of future progress. In any case the movement is symptomatic of a philosophy of secondary education which is being discussed, if not actually and fully put into practical effect in many European countries and which, whether consciously or not, is the foundation on which you in Mexico are beginning to build. This philosophy in brief is this:

A national system of secondary education must be closely articulated with primary education, must reflect the various activities of national life, and must provide for the needs of adolescent boys and girls.

A system of secondary education must provide a series of differentiated activities or courses adapted to differences in the interests of the student body.

In all types of schools included under the category of secondary the just claims of a liberal or general education should not be ignored, for it is this part of education that helps to integrate the different sections of society, gives them a common language, and lays the basis for the development of a national culture.

Liberal education does not consist alone of knowledge obtained from books nor is knowledge or information alone a liberal education, for it must be related to the larger interests of humanity, to the practical everyday work of society, and to immediate living interests.

Approached from this point of view the conflict between culture and utility disappears. *Nihil humanum a me alienum puto* gives a cultural and utilitarian slant to our new conception of liberal education. It is this new conception that gives vigor and force to the new tendency to look on all post-elementary education as a unit, and it provides adequate scope for differentiation, each receiving what is best suited to his needs and yet all receiving the same common elements of general education. The school thus ceases to be an isolated, cloistered institution, and becomes a part of contemporary social life, seeking at once to interpret to the coming genera-

tion the world around it and at the same time to lay the foundations for further progress.

My theme today was education for the formation of character and I may seem to have wandered from it. But on closer examination it will be seen that I have not done so. If the present tendencies in England mean anything, they indicate an expansion of the national conception of the aim of education. Hitherto England has devoted most of her efforts for character-formation to the activities outside the classroom; today she is looking for an adaptation of the curriculum to the same ends. It may be objected that adaptation to individual needs means libertinism and chaos. This objection can easily be disposed of by the answer that, after all, individual needs but reflect the social environment, and the function of the school is to select from social activities those things that are rich and worth while. It may be objected that this movement is prompted by "soft" pedagogy. The objection can be answered by the question whether an individual grows more by failure and by making mistakes in tasks that are too difficult or meaningless for him, or whether such growth is not likely to be more surely guaranteed by tasks that appeal to the individual's intelligence, that are within his powers, and that he can accomplish with success.

Thus England, in her attempt to provide a secondary education for every normal boy or girl of about the age of twelve, in her desire to provide an education suited to individual needs, intelligence, and capacities, in her recognition that differentiation must take into account both general and practical education and must be adapted to social requirements, is but rounding out the outstanding feature of her educational tradition. The formation of character on the moral and social side has always been England's pride; today she recognizes that character development involves also an intellectual side. The discussion of the tendencies in English education thus supplements my consideration of the French and German tendencies; England is now at the stage of

strengthening her educational system at a point in which she has hitherto been weak—intellectual training; Germany and France only partially are borrowing the strong feature of the English tradition—moral and social training.

IV

Education for an Intelligent Democracy

The movements that I have traced up to this period are pointed in the same general direction. In brief outline they consist of a demand for an adaptation to modern needs of the type of secondary education that has become traditional, an insistence everywhere on differentiation, and a general recognition that the opportunities for secondary education must be increased for adolescents of those social classes that have hitherto not enjoyed them. Each country with which I have so far dealt places its emphasis on one or another or even on all these points. At the same time the importance of an élite is not ignored, but it is recognized in addition that this élite is desirable in all activities of modern society and not alone in that which has hitherto been somewhat narrowly considered as intellectual.

In turning to a discussion of secondary education in the United States it is not my intention to claim that all the tendencies discussed so far have been realized, but rather to point out that the whole problem of the education of the adolescent has been approached with more imagination, with a broader analysis of all its implications, and with attention to most of the factors involved in the relation of such education not only to other educational institutions but also to the needs of society. It may be objected that the United States has been able to do this because of her vast resources, but, as I hope to prove, financial resources could not alone have been responsible for the present organization of secondary education, if the accumulation of a large number of factors arising out of the traditional type of secondary education had not

been subjected to scientific investigation and the results had not been made the basis of reconstruction. An English educator once remarked that in education the United States is a great experimental laboratory, and this statement, made over thirty years ago, is still true.

But if the methods of the laboratory are responsible in the United States for constant unrest and self-criticism, if from the outside we appear to be in constant process of change and readjustment, the fundamental principles on which American education is based do not change. It is these principles that serve as a signpost pointing in the direction that education in the United States desires to take. These principles, though simple in their statement, are not always as easy to realize. The first is that education must be universal and efficient. The second demands equality of opportunity for the individual compatible with his intelligence and ability. The third principle is that the educational organization shall stimulate and assist the pupil. And the last principle rests on the recognition that an educational system must give equal attention to the development of character and to the training of intelligence. It is these principles that have made the experiment in democratic education in the United States the most striking feature in its social organization. Today the high school is the building to which the small communities point with greatest pride.

The factors that have produced the changing conception of secondary education are simple. Before analyzing them I should like to point out that the whole movement is recent. The unrest began as it did in Europe in the last decade of the nineteenth century; in its more recent aspects the movement is barely twenty years old. The unrest of the nineties was due to the pressure of the college entrance requirements; the more recent movement is due to the change in educational philosophy developed in the main by John Dewey, to a technique of social analysis, and, finally, to the contributions of educational psychology. As I give you the more immediate

factors, you will, I hope, recognize how very similar they are to the approach to the whole problem that you are now making in Mexico.

The whole question was opened up by what was in fact the corollary of the dissatisfaction with the domination exercised by the college entrance requirements. This problem really presented itself in this form: Of what value was it for society to maintain and for the individual to pass through an educational system which produced so many failures as measured by examinations for college entrance? From the failure of those who persisted through the whole course attention was next directed to the large number who entered the high school but left after one, two, or three years without completing the course. Starting from these two points attention was next directed to an examination of the function and aims of secondary education in general, whether it was to be provided at public expense for the few to be prepared for college, or whether it did not have much broader functions in preparing individuals to be of greatest service to themselves and to society. Putting the matter simply it was recognized that society, always in a state of evolution, cannot be satisfied with an education that is static.

This principle is simple and has in fact been the cause of considerable protest and criticism almost throughout the history of secondary education, a fact which is too often ignored. The charge that the United States is lacking in culture is a charge that is not uncommon, even in the country itself. But I submit that if culture means anything, it means not only familiarity with the best that has been done and said in the world, but an appreciation of the needs and facts of the world in which we live, an appreciation of those things that are worth while and of the meaning of human institutions. I maintain that the brightest periods in the history of secondary education from the time of the Greeks have been those in which the attempt was made to adapt education to contemporary needs. The connotation of culture, however, has

hitherto been determined by the few who had enjoyed the limited opportunities offered to acquire it and who in general had no immediate concerns with the workings of everyday life. I do not wish to be misunderstood; it is not my intention to claim that the United States has by any means achieved a new form of culture; my purpose is to point out that a new conception has, at any rate, been formulated and that its practical realization is still in an experimental stage.

Following from this new philosophy of education there came the recognition that secondary education must conform to the current ideals and must meet the changing demands of society. It has been realized, for example, that the school must contribute to the new demands that democracy is making on intelligent citizenship and must develop a knowledge of and an interest in present forms of social organization. From these points of view one of the first aims of the school is to promote efficient membership in society, which implies not only ability and intelligence to perform one's duties as a citizen but ability to be economically self-sufficient. At the same time the school must also develop ability to utilize one's leisure time. The first task of the school then is to develop ideals and habits of social and civic duties. As a consequence the principle has been established that society must determine and control the chief agency upon which its well-being and progress depend. While there is no law to prevent the establishment of private schools, it is claimed in general that their function should in the main be experimental.

But this first function, the integrative function of the school which aims at securing homogeneity of ideals and mutual understanding among the future citizens of the country, is not the only one that has prompted the American public to provide and maintain the high school at its own expense. Another reason is the desire to provide opportunities for prolonged education to all individuals who have the ability and capacity to profit thereby. The provision of educational opportunities at public expense and the rapid spread of this

ideal throughout the country led to a remarkable increase of students which in turn produced a new set of problems and a new approach to the whole problem of secondary education. Obviously all the students were not destined for an education beyond the secondary school. Further, statistical investigation had shown that the traditional type of education resulted not only in many failures but also in a large degree of mortality among the students. The secondary school thus had to take these new facts into account and seek to adjust the curriculum to the needs of the individual.

Educational psychology had already begun to emphasize the theory of individual differences, which simply proved scientifically that individuals differ in ability, capacity, and tastes. This fact, which is after all but one of common sense and observation, was dismissed by the old school with the statement that an individual who failed had no brains. At best, as a result of the unrest of which I have spoken in the European schools in the nineteenth century, the recognition of individual differences was met by the substitution of modern for classical languages. The full implication of the fact was not realized until the present movement for more differentiation gathered force. The American theory from the first was that individual differences implied not necessarily differences in intellectual ability but rather differences in tastes and capacities. Hence to the function already mentioned, that of integration or securing homogeneity of social and civic ideals, the school has another function to add, that of discovering individual tastes and organizing curricula to meet them.

Both functions, that of promoting homogeneity and that of meeting the needs of the individual, were corroborated by another factor which is typically American and is borrowed from the business world. Expenditures for education, buildings, equipment, and salaries were looked upon as a public investment, and, as in the business world, so in education failure to produce results came to be regarded as a sign of lack

of efficiency. Educationally the principle that was developed from this method of approach is that no matter what the duration of a pupil's stay in school may be, it must be made valuable both for the individual and for society. In other words, in education as in the manufacturing process there must be as little waste as possible. And yet the analogy cannot be pressed too closely. The subsequent development of intelligence tests has shown that even with the broadest extension of the secondary school program there are individuals whom nature has failed to endow with sufficient intellectual ability to profit from any educational course whatever beyond a certain level of ordinary attainments. This phase of the problem of adolescent education and equality of opportunities still remains to be solved. But the general tendency of the theory developed so far is best shown by the fact that in California the majority of the pupils who complete the elementary school continue to the high school.

One other factor still remains to be added to those that have led to the reconstruction of the principles of secondary education. In the traditional secondary schools one of the arguments against change and in favor of the retention of the conventional subjects of instruction was that they trained the mind and sharpened the intelligence of the pupils, even though in themselves they had lost any significance for modern times. This argument, the notion of formal discipline, which really meant that it did not matter what a pupil studied so long as he was compelled to study it, was soon attacked after the technique of scientific measurement was developed. In its place have been substituted the principles that an individual learns best those things in which he has an interest, and that training transfers only to a slight extent provided special attention is directed to serve such transfer. In other words, the principle was adopted that subjects as such have no particular and inherent value for mental training and are no substitute for meaningful content and good

teaching. The interpretation of this principle has in practice led almost to an abandonment of the consideration of the educational values of subjects in general and the adoption of a vast array of subjects that are supposed to meet the interests, needs, and capacities of the large army of pupils now enrolled in the high schools.

Before proceeding to a consideration of the theory that has been derived from these various sources of influence, it is necessary to discuss briefly the relation of the secondary school to other educational institutions. The first criticism of the traditional practices arose, as I have indicated, from dissatisfaction with the requirements imposed on the high school for admission to college. It was felt that the domination of the high school by the college tended to limit its work and prevented an expansion of the curriculum in directions otherwise considered desirable. The way out had already been indicated as early as the seventies by the University of Michigan, which adopted the practice of admitting students from accredited high schools without further examination. This practice spread and is today the one most generally followed throughout the country, with the exception of most of the private endowed institutions in the East. The practice of accrediting high schools has been facilitated by the fact that the state universities and high schools are both maintained by public authorities closely related to each other. The system of accrediting, exercised sometimes by the state university, sometimes by the state board of education, sometimes by both in coöperation, has done much to standardize secondary education. It has been supplemented by the organization of various associations whose scope extends beyond the limits of one state alone. Another and more recent type of relationship between the college and the high school has been the introduction of a system of admission by a combination of a pupil's record, scholastic and general, during his high school course, and a number of psychological tests of intelligence and achievement. First adopted by

Columbia University the practice has been introduced in a number of other colleges and universities.

The traditional high school was an institution giving a course of four years beyond that of the elementary school. The absence of close articulation with the elementary school, the sudden change of methods and control, and the short duration of the course had already begun to attract attention some thirty years ago. It was not, however, until about fifteen years ago that more direct attention began to be devoted to these problems and to lead to the gradual introduction of the six-year high school, divided into the junior high school and the senior high school, each of three years' duration, and built upon the basis of six years of primary education. Here we have the same recognition that we found in France and in England that the primary school can well fulfill its functions in six years, from the ages of six to twelve, that hitherto the last two years of the traditional elementary school had been wasted, and that new interests begin to develop with the onset of adolescence.

The junior high school in the United States has been established, therefore, to secure better coördination with primary education, to bridge the gap that has existed hitherto between elementary and secondary education and to retain pupils in school beyond their fourteenth birthday by providing them with a range of activities more varied and richer than was provided in the last two years of the elementary schools. A reorganization of the school system on the basis of six years of primary education, followed by a self-contained general education of three years, makes possible the introduction in the junior high school of the departmental system in which the subjects can be taught by specialists. The special function of the junior high school, or the first three years of secondary education is to discover the interests and capacities of the pupils by introducing them to the chief departments of human knowledge and activity, both academic and practical. Education in the junior high school thus retains a general

character but introduces into the curriculum a far wider range of activities, materials, and content than were possible under the traditional system. Through variation and differentiation the junior high school seeks to give the pupil an opportunity of discovering himself and on the basis of this discovery to guide him in his subsequent choice of studies or occupation. The junior high school makes no attempt to give specialized vocational preparation. If industrial and vocational activities are provided in the junior high school, this is done partly to give the pupil an appreciation of the place of such activities in modern social organization and partly to give him an opportunity of discovering his tastes and capacities. The first three years of secondary or adolescent education in the United States aim, just as is proposed in France and in England and only partially in Germany, to be general in character and to lead on to specialization after about the age of fifteen. One important difference must, however, be mentioned and that is that the single American institution known as the high school is undertaking to perform the task distributed in other countries in a number of different institutions, a fact due largely to a desire to maintain the unitary institution in the interests of democratic solidarity.

The position and purpose of the American high school can now, I hope, be appreciated. Its foundation is built on a desire to meet the demands of a progressive society and to provide for the individual such an education as will enable him to make the best of himself according to his ability and intelligence. From the one point of view the function of the high school is to integrate, from the other it is to differentiate. Viewed in the light of certain other systems of secondary education the examination as an end in itself has disappeared; looked at from another angle the notion of preparation is kept in the background in favor of an education which at each step in the process is valuable in itself and which because education is growth can allow the preparatory concept to

take care of itself; approached from still another point education for an élite does not predominate over other ends but theoretically the élite is expected to emerge spontaneously by leaving open as many opportunities for variation and differentiation as possible. The system instead of being directly selective is rather distributive, aiming to provide the proper education for the individual according to his ability.

A mere general statement of the purpose of the secondary school would be inadequate as a guide to its organization and work. Hence its specific functions have been analyzed. From the point of view of society one of the functions of the school is the development of the individual on the social-civic side. This means the utilization of such materials and content as will develop a sense of social duty and civic ideals. Equally important is the cultivation in the individual of an appreciation of the economic organization of society as one of its characteristic aspects of modern life; and this in turn has the same implications and helps to give the individual some guidance in the selection of a vocation. The next interest of the school is to develop the physical well-being of the individual not only through physical exercises and sports but also through direct instruction in hygiene and sanitation. Further, since modern economic organization is leaving the individual with an increasing amount of free time at his disposal, another duty of the school is to train for leisure, to develop tastes, and to cultivate interests. Finally, the school must endeavor to provide such differentiated work as is suited to the interests, inclinations, and capacities of the individual according to his probable future career.

It is obvious from this analysis of the functions and aims of secondary education that it is difficult to distinguish between the interests of society and the interests of the individual. What is good for the individual must be in the interests of society, and what is in the interests of society furnishes the field for the selection of educational materials that are valuable for the individual. This does not mean, as is sometimes

assumed, the exclusion of many of the subjects that have been traditionally associated with secondary education. But the theory means more; it means the investigation and admission of new subjects that will contribute to the general end. Thus in the education of all students civics and social studies, hitherto supposed to be taught incidentally in connection with history, emerge as separate subjects; hygiene and sanitation, offering a content of equal importance to society and the individual, are given a definite place in the curriculum; in the case of girls duties associated with the home and the care of children, because of the importance of the home as a social institution, are assigned a definite place in the curriculum with an emphasis not only on the improvement of standards of living but also on developing an appreciation of the aesthetic aspects of home life. Thus the high school attempts to adapt itself to the training of students in such activities as social usage and common life demand. Secondary education is in fact becoming not a luxury but a necessity in the broad social sense. Hence the demand that education should be vital and functioning, and that its programs and methods be evaluated from the point of view of modern social structure. Beyond these general aims of education for all, the high schools have undertaken in the last years of the course to provide extensively for specialization according to individual needs and capacities, both academic and vocational.

What, on these principles, becomes of culture in the traditional sense, of centuries of liberal education, of disinterested studies? As I have already indicated these are not excluded, if we wish to think of them in terms of languages, ancient and modern, history and geography, mathematics and sciences. Elements of these are retained but a sincere attempt is made, even though, it may be admitted, not always successfully, to return to the old conception of the humanities as those studies that are of most significance to man. The Greeks said that philosophy arose through

wonder. It is not farfetched, I think, to say that American principles of secondary education attempt to present various aspects of life and to let the philosophers emerge later. Traditional secondary education, if one may say so, attempted first to make philosophers but without the basic foundation of wonder at the many aspects of the world in which we live. Because of the admitted failure of such an approach which reached only a small minority, secondary education in the United States has in the last twenty years entered on a new track and the critics of the new principles tend to forget the recency of their origin. The American public at any rate is willing to pay for education along the lines indicated to the extent that their high schools today have an enrollment of about three million students or about one in forty of the population.

The practical philosophy of secondary education described so far is accompanied in general by a tendency to emphasize activity methods. Knowledge is not given the place that it once held and the emphasis is placed on cultivating in the individual ability to study for himself, to handle situations by whatever methods they may call for, to exercise initiative and independence, and to command himself and his environment. A distinction is not made between methods in the elementary and the secondary school; nor is the one type of school raised above the other by being designated as "academic" in contrast with less desirable characteristics of the other. It is accepted that education means growth, a continuous process, only the materials varying with maturity. To this extent the United States shares the new philosophy of education adopted by Germany and to a less degree by England.

The program for the development of character in social situations is being carried more extensively than ever beyond the activities of the classroom to those activities that have a natural appeal for the adolescent. Thus enlarged opportunities are afforded for physical training and athletics,

and for the development of organizations that will promote the well-being of the school and its members, and for a great variety of activities that are represented by the varied interests of groups of students. These include debating and literary societies, music clubs, school journals, and many others. Throughout all these activities opportunities are offered not merely for the cultivation of a variety of interests but also for the exercise of those qualities of coöperation, management, and leadership that are later valuable in adult society. At the same time these so-called extra-curricular activities offer an opportunity for the discovery of interests and abilities which cannot always be probed in the regular work of the classroom. Again, as in England traditionally and in Germany since the reform, it is fully recognized in the United States that as much scope as possible should be given the individual for many-sided development and for moral and social training through corporate activities. Fundamentally the individual is developed on his moral as well as on his intellectual side through life in institutions. Hence the school as one of these institutions rather than a mere aggregation of teachers and students has from this point of view a tremendous opportunity through encouraging the development of a social atmosphere of coöperation, of *esprit de corps*.

I have indicated the main principles underlying the recent development of secondary education in the United States. May I insist again that these are still in a stage of transition, of being interpreted for practical use? Fifteen to twenty years are a brief span for the development of an educational system or for the full realization of its implications. That there are critics of the secondary school is to be expected and is a sign of health and vigor rather than otherwise. The first conflict is naturally with those of an earlier generation who either cannot or do not wish to see any virtue in change and who tend to see a decline in the quality of education. Another difficulty is the attempt of small high schools to perform all the functions of the modern secondary school

without adequate resources and often without an adequate staff of teachers. Difficulties that arise from the characteristically American method of quantitative organization and administration would lead me too far from my immediate purpose to discuss. More serious, in my opinion, is the criticism that comes from the inadequate supply of well-trained teachers; the high school has grown so rapidly in the last few years that this aspect of the problem, which is fundamental to its sound development, has been somewhat neglected. One other criticism was anticipated about a century ago by De Tocqueville when he expressed the fear that a broad democratic system of education might lead to the development of mediocrity. To some extent this is true; we have attempted to do the best possible for the average and have not done enough for the best. Fortunately this is now being realized, and efforts are being made to provide special measures for dealing with the abler students. I have said nothing today about the selection of an élite as one of the functions of the American high school, mainly because it is not regarded as a function separate and distinct from that of education in general. The American principle is to provide the best opportunities possible compatible with the demands of society and the needs of the individual and to leave the rest to a sort of natural selection. To this is being added an effort to provide more consciously for pupils of more than average intelligence but without departing from this general principle.

To attempt a summary of the present status of secondary education in the United States would be difficult. And yet I cannot close this presentation more conveniently than with a quotation of the purposes of the high school formulated by my colleague, Professor Thomas H. Briggs, "The general purposes of the high school are (1) to teach the pupils to do better the desirable activities that they will perform anyway, and (2) to reveal higher types of activities and to make these desired and to an extent possible."

General Summary

I have attempted in the four lectures that I have presented here to indicate the chief problems that confront secondary education today and to indicate some general tendencies, some realized, some to be solved in the future. I think that it is not difficult to point out the general trend, for you in Mexico are participants in the movement.

In general it is everywhere recognized that higher education must help to produce an élite, but it is equally recognized that the type of education that produces the ten per cent that constitutes the finished product is not necessarily best suited to the needs of the remaining ninety per cent. Everywhere thought is being directed not only to the needs of this group but also to the necessity of providing increased opportunities for post-elementary education to a larger number of boys and girls. The consequence of this is a well-marked movement to recognize a variety of types of post-elementary education as secondary.

This means that post-elementary education should not consist of a large number of unrelated and unarticulated types of education, a conglomeration of trade, industrial, commercial, higher elementary, intermediate, and secondary schools, each having different social values; but rather that it should include a large variety of opportunities suited to individual needs, closely interrelated, without artificial barriers, leading the individual as far as his ability and intelligence will take him. If modern educational psychology has any significant contribution to make, it is certainly in the emphasis on individual differences; up to the present these have been met in most systems of secondary education by substituting modern for classical languages.

But the problem of adolescent education, for that is what secondary education is coming to be, does not stop merely with efforts to meet individual needs and abilities. The philosophy that at present underlies the reforms in elemen-

tary education must be applied to education that succeeds it. The problem, in a word, is to discover a new conception of culture, a definition not in terms of so many subjects but in terms adapted to the intellectual levels of adolescents and having their origin in the activities, institutions, thought, and organization of modern society. Instead of accepting standards that are rigid, adolescent education conceived in terms of individual and social needs would enrich both society and the individual. Such an approach does not mean the exclusion of subjects traditionally associated with secondary education, but it means a method of approach to each of them that will make them more vital, significant, and meaningful. It means something more: it will involve an expansion of the number of "subjects" in the program of adolescent education to include activities that have been hitherto neglected as uneducative, or lacking in disciplinary value, or as too easy, or else taught "incidentally." Thus in a modern society an adolescent on completing his education would not come out of school ignorant of the meaning of life about him, ignorant of the place of science and industry in an industrial age, contemptuous of activities and vocations on which society of today is based, without any knowledge of the recent history of his country and of its political and social organization, and, worse still, without any interest or desire to find out about any of these things, because the school has failed to point out their significance and value to him.

That the new movement and tendencies inevitably invite criticism everywhere is natural. But it must be remembered that the movement as a whole is less than a quarter of a century old and comes into conflict with a tradition that has three centuries of practice behind it. Whatever prejudices and preconceptions have been established in this period can only be combated by careful study and even more careful preparation of teachers. Practice up to the present may have been halting; the results may not have given desired

results. But at least this may be said in conclusion that the theory underlying the new tendencies is sound and that it has the warrant of being the subject of discussion and of some experimentation in the four leading countries of the world that I have tried to present to you in the course of these lectures.

INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING AND THE SCHOOLS*

THERE is a strong tendency today to make the schools responsible for activities and movements that do not appear to thrive through other organizations. It is unnecessary here to mention any of these. From one point of view it is a healthy sign that the schools are recognized as the most fruitful medium for forming the opinions of coming generations; from another there is a very real danger that the schools may be used for propaganda purposes and that the curriculum may ultimately be unable to bear the load of additional subjects or activities. It is not, therefore, the purpose of this paper to suggest any additions to the already overburdened curriculum of the high school.

What do we mean when we talk of international understanding? Broadly speaking, it is that attitude which recognizes the possibilities of service of our own nation and of other nations in a common cause, the cause of humanity, the readiness to realize that other nations along with our own have by virtue of their common humanity the ability to contribute something of worth to the progress of civilization. Any other conception would simply mean a return to the Greek division of the world into Greeks and barbarians. This point appears to be so obvious and almost so superficial as not to be worth mentioning. And yet if one were to analyze the common conception of nationalism, it may be

* Address delivered before the National Association of Secondary School Principals, February, 1925.

wondered whether and to what extent it really differs from the old Greek notion. For, in thinking of other nations or of foreigners, we do tend to think first of their peculiarities and eccentricities, features that differentiate them from us, rather than of those qualities and virtues that make them human beings like ourselves. The basis of international understanding was already sounded two thousand years ago in a Latin poet's *Nihil humanum a me alienum puto*, and the common cause to which reference has just been made has nowhere been better summarized than by Carlyle, "Are not all true men that live, or that ever lived, soldiers of the same army, enlisted under Heaven's captaincy to do battle against the same enemy—the empire of Darkness and Wrong? Why should we misknow one another and fight, not against the enemy, but against ourselves, for mere differences of uniform?" More recently President Butler defined the international mind as follows: "The international mind is the habit of thinking of the several nations of the civilized world as friendly coöperating equals in aiding the progress of civilization, in developing commerce and industry, and in spreading enlightenment and culture throughout the world. Not sentiment or plans for peace or programs but the adoption of the ideals of human liberty, justice, and honorable conduct of an orderly and humane society."

The word "international" is today either out of favor and under suspicion or abused through sentimentality. The first because it is associated with communism, bolshevism, or other isms, with which it has no necessary relations; the second because of emphasis on an idea without content, a superabundant flow of sympathy without appreciation of its implications, love without understanding. One important reason why internationalism may be open to suspicion is due to the mistaken notion that it is opposed to nationalism. Nothing could be further from the truth. Just as true, genuine nationalism or patriotism is impossible without individual self-realization, without loyalty to self, one's

family, the various groups that exist for associated living, so international understanding is impossible without loyalty to one's own nation, based on an appreciation of her resources and potential contributions to the progress of mankind. "Know thyself" is a principle as essential for national as for individual well-being. The development of international understanding in the only sense in which it can be used is independent of any consideration of legal or political organizations which may indeed become mechanical devices rather than promoters of understanding; it may constitute the basis of these, but only if and when the time is ripe. "The Parliament of Man and Federation of the World" is only a poetical license. An international attitude can in no way involve a repudiation of patriotism; indeed, because its basis should be a recognition of the part played by other countries as well as our own in the progress of the world, and recognition that there is room for differences of race and traits which make up national character, it should intensify patriotism and quicken the consciousness of those things that make our own country great in the service of humanity.

What can the school do to promote such international understanding? It is not necessary, at any rate in the high school period, to add another subject to the curriculum. For a study of international relations there may be room in colleges, but in the high schools the development of international understanding should be a matter of emphasis. The curriculum is ample enough and broad enough to serve the purpose. Underlying the whole work of any school and irrespective of any subject matter there is everywhere the larger aim of cultivating certain ideals—fair play, coöperation, service, justice; what shall be the limits of these ideals in practice? Have they served their purpose when applied to ourselves and to our fellow-pupils, or are they effective only in so far as they furnish standards of value in our relations to all social, civic, and national questions, and beyond that in the relations of our nation to others, or of our-

selves personally to other nationals? Otherwise would we not run the risk of setting up dual standards and the consequent maladjustment that comes from such a condition? Justice, liberty, and honorable conduct are ideals that are human and should transcend national boundaries.

It is obvious, however, that these ideals can only have validity in so far as they are based on a knowledge and an appreciation of facts. There is not a subject in the high school curriculum which cannot contribute some knowledge of facts bearing on international relations. And the central feature in our methods today may in all fairness be stated as a desire to cultivate the habit of critically evaluating facts, of sifting the correct from the incorrect, the logical from the illogical, truth from falsehood. The fundamental weakness in social and political development, a weakness that is universal, is that this critical attitude, which we aim to develop in our schools, is not applied to social and political questions. Here we tend to be creatures of heredity and prejudice; too often we place interests above honor. Both national and international understanding require the application of a critical attitude if sane progress is to continue.

But a critical attitude that does not have its foundations in a command of facts is mere cavilling. What is the equipment in facts or knowledge desirable for an international attitude? They are everywhere present in our curriculum, were we but ready to recognize them. In the field of games and athletics our records are no longer national but world records; in every athletic activity even the smallest nation is today represented in international meets; international college events and, where distances are not great, as in Europe, international school events are increasing in number. In folk dances, in music, and in art ample opportunities are afforded for emphasizing the contributions of different nations to the world. Music and art, indeed, recognize no national boundaries; we do not or should not think of painters or sculptors or composers or musicians as German or

French or Italian or English; they belong to the world; their works are for humanity as a whole. Is not the same thing becoming increasingly true of literature; is not literature a common spiritual heritage? It is natural for us to think of British authors as our own; but are not the great writers of other countries gradually assuming a place in our literary world? A book of merit in a foreign language is scarcely a month old before it is translated and becomes ours; and this is equally true of the drama. Admittedly in our preoccupation with grammar and language and examinable achievements we neglect literature; but the opportunity is there to be seized and experiments along these lines are not wanting. It is not an accident that the literary subjects are termed "humanities"; it is our fault that they are not treated as such and do not serve as a bond that binds centuries and generations together in a consciousness of common service.

This point of common service may be somewhat elusive in the spiritual field; but apply it to the sciences, whether pure or applied, and the implication becomes obvious. Scientific progress except through the utilization of products and ideas and discoveries wherever found, irrespective of national origin, is unthinkable. One has but to think of national minds that have gone to the development of our modern life—the radio, the aeroplane, the telephone, and so on; or of the contributions in the medical sciences which at once become the property of humanity, not of a nation. This does not mean that we need to surrender or minimize our pride in the contributions of our own citizens, but it does mean that we can derive a new ideal of international coöperation and service. The advancement of science is not a national but an international or human service. It should engender the attitude that we cannot utilize the products, spiritual or material, of the citizen of any country and continue to despise his fellow citizens.

The study of geography has the possibilities of both the humanities and the sciences. While on the one hand it

deals with the influences of nature or man, it does on the other emphasize how men in different parts of the world live and work and the essential interdependence of humanity for the raw and manufactured products of the world, which manifests itself in the development of transport, means of communication, industry and commerce, and international finance. The effects of dislocation of industry in one country are felt immediately in another; a change of fashion in one part of the world may spell ruin in another. The world is becoming smaller, which means simply that the common unity of man is increasing. It does not require a special course in economics to develop the theme today that commercially and industrially the world is one and that few nations are sufficiently blessed with the world's resources to live alone without stagnating. And furthermore, this applies not merely to the exchange of essential commodities but to business as well.

The subject that has been most abused everywhere, our own country not excepted, is history. Round this subject more than any other heated controversies have raged and are still raging. And yet what subject has greater possibilities if studied from the point of view of the service of man to man or of nations to the world? It is a platitude to say that the political and military aspects of history have been overemphasized; but it is not possible to retain these and with the addition of a study of the progress of civilization and social organization to develop an attitude which compares the permanent contributions of each nation or period that have resulted on the one hand through war and on the other from the pursuits of peace. What has survived of Greek history?—the warlike or the peaceful pursuits—her literature, science, art, and philosophy? Was it not the Greeks who early evolved a system of arbitration of their disputes? Did Rome contribute as much to future generations through war as through the *Pax Romana*, through building of roads, through her language and her laws, and the first glimmerings

of the idea of a law of nations? And similar emphasis can be found without difficulty throughout history, always indicating that, where war and an abuse of the principle of nationalism have severed, and kept apart, everything that has contributed to the benefit of mankind has helped to draw it closer together in a bond of common interests. In the nineteenth century in particular the evidences of a growing sense of internationalism can be taken up in treating the development of international organization for human welfare, the abolition of slavery, prison reform, the Red Cross, international congresses and societies of scholars in different fields, the Universal Postal Union, arbitration treaties culminating in the more recent movements to control or stop wars. Governments may be slow in promoting or adopting such movements, but their peoples, conscious of the need, will continue to increase them.

Finally, the study of current events may any morning reveal the interdependence of the peoples of the world. A disaster in Japan or Italy will call forth the lurking bonds of sympathy; a new discovery in any field of science will illustrate community of interests; the state of the financial market may affect millions in different corners of the globe. If the new "social sciences" have not been discussed, it is because their content is still in the making, but here too the teacher who knows the ramifications of his subject can do much to promote international understanding. In a very real sense every nation may say today as Pericles said of Athens at the height of his glory, "We enjoy the fruits of other countries as freely as if they were our own."

In these various ways and by the proper utilization of subjects already available international understanding may be promoted naturally and in its manifold settings. Above all let us avoid the addition of a new subject with specialist teachers, for departmentalization and specialization will inevitably lead to thinking in compartments, while what is desired in the development of citizenship, in stimulating patriotism,

and in cultivating international understanding is to leave with the pupil a sense of service and the manifold ways in which it can be performed. If the pupil passes out of the high school with a realization, as has been well stated, that civilization has been a collective achievement, in which his nation has borne a proud share along with others, that it is common heritage and a joint responsibility of all nations, he will have gone far toward a realization of international understanding, which implies the recognition of a common humanity, based on common knowledge and devoted to common ends.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE

Educational Yearbook, 1924
Educational Yearbook, 1925
Educational Yearbook, 1926
Educational Yearbook, 1927
Educational Yearbook, 1928
Educational Yearbook, 1929

ALEXANDER, T. *The Training of Elementary Teachers in Germany.* 1929

ALEXANDER, T., MCMURRY, R. E., and MULLER, M. *Modern Foreign Language Teachers in Germany.* 1930

KANDEL, I. L. *French Elementary Schools: Official Courses of Study.* 1927

KANDEL, I. L. and ALEXANDER, T. *Reorganization of Education in Prussia.* 1927

MILAM, AVA B. *A Study of the Student Homes of China.* 1930

MONROE, P. *Essays in Comparative Education.* 1927

RUSSELL, W. F. *Schools of Bulgaria.* 1924

A Survey of the Educational System of the Philippine Islands. 1925

Guidebook to Some European School Systems. (Issued by The Institute in coöperation with the Bureau International d'Education, Geneva.) 1927

370 K13 c.1

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY

PUBLIC LIBRARY
DETROIT, MICH.

Philosophy
Religion and

The number of books that may be drawn at one time by the card holder is governed by the reasonable needs of the reader and the material on hand.

Books for junior readers are subject to special rules.

Rem-Rand. Library Bureau.